
A STUDY ON THE PROGRAMME EFFECTIVENESS OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
IN PRIVATE HOUSING IN HONG KONG

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirement for the degree
of Master of Social Work in the
Chinese University of Hong Kong

June 1994

By
Leung Kwong Cheong

Supervisors
Mr. Fung Ho Lup
Dr. Agnes Ng
Dr. T.L. Lui

UL

thesis
HN
755.2
C6L48
1984



CONTENT

Acknowledgement

Abstract

Tables

CHAPTER

I	INTRODUCTION	p.1
II	LITERATURE REVIEW	p.5
III	CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND OPERATIONAL DEFINITION	p.36
IV	METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY	p.47
V	PROFILE OF THE TWO SAMPLE GROUPS	p.53
VI	FINDINGS AND RESULTS	p.59
VII	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	p.82

REFERENCE

APPENDIX

Questionnaire

Acknowledgement

I am deeply indebted to many respectable individuals who offered their time energy and support in making my study possible. Most grateful acknowledgement is firstly made to my two dissertation supervisors, who are Mr. Fung Ho Lap and Dr. Agnes Ng, for their patient guidance and constructive suggestions in the process of conducting this study. I am also grateful to Dr. T.L. Lui for his valuable suggestions and comments.

I would like to thank the following persons they gave me valuable supports and helping in different areas, Miss Tsui Suet Ming, for data programming; Mr. Lee Chi Fai, for coding and data processing; Miss Tsang Suk Ling, fieldwork supervisor; Miss Lo Tak Ching and Miss Chui Shui Chu, for data coding; Mr. Wong Kin Man, (Kwun Tong District Board member) sharing information on the sampled buildings; those community workers who gave comments on the validity of the questionnaire; those interviewers who helped in the data collection.

Lastly, I am greatly indebted to my family for their understanding and support throughout the period of MSW study.

ABSTRACT

This study was an outcome programme evaluation on the effects of community development outcomes for the residents living in the private housing blocks. The aim was to explore and establish whether the implementation of CDSs would affect some changes of residents' attitudes and behaviors in the private housing in relation to the goals of community development. Three major criteria variables were used: residents' participation, neighborliness, and sense of belonging.

The methodology used was an Ex-post facto research design. Two groups, one group of residents from the Lee Kei private housing building with the implementation of CDSs by the Caritas-HK was taken as the experimental group and the other group of residents from another Wang Kwong House without such provision was chosen as the control group.

The measurement of CDSs programme impacts was a self-constructed questionnaire. Data was collected through interviewing two sample groups of residents from the same community. Respondents had similar background as well as socio-demographic characteristics.

A total of 174 household heads or their spouses were selected by random from the two buildings for the interviews. After introducing some sufficiently statistical control on the socio-demographic variables, 88 and 72 respective cases of the experimental and control groups were used for data analysis. Simple statistical techniques of frequency comparison and chi-square test were used.

The survey results found limited significance on the three testing hypotheses:

1. With the implementation of CDSs, residents' participation level in the building management affairs would be higher than those residents without such CDSs provision.
2. With the implementation of CDSs, the neighborliness was more intensive than those residents without such CDSs provision.
3. With the implementation of CDSs, the residents' level of sense of belonging was slightly higher than those residents without such CDSs provision.

Profile of the two sample groups

I	Sex difference of the respondents	53
II	Years of residence of the respondents in the building	54
III	Years of residence of the respondents in the district	55
IV	Age of the respondents	55
V	Education level of the respondents	56
VI	Economic status of the respondents	57
VII	Personal monthly income of the respondents	57
VIII	Plan to move out	58

Findings and results

1	knowing the existence of the O.I.	60
2	knowing the years of existence of the O.I.	61
3	recognizing how many O.I. members	61
4	knowing the existence of the DMC	63
5	joining activities concerning the DMC	63
6	building management problems needed improvement	65
7	taking individual action to improve the problems	65
8	taking collective action to improve the problems	66
9	joining activities	68
10	frequency in joining any activities	69
11	reading local community newspaper	69
12	frequency in reading local community newspaper	69
13	registered as voter	71
14	will register	71
15	seeking help from members of DB/UC/LC	71
16	numbers of neighbor recognized and chatted with	73
17	numbers of neighbor offered help	74
18	interactional activities	75
19	overall attitudes towards overall neighborliness	75
20	residents' cooperation to improve buildings' problems	77
21	residents' satisfaction towards the building	78
22	perception of the building	79
23	reaction to social award to the building	79
24	concern about the building affairs	80
25	willingness to serve for the building	81

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 General situation in private housing

According to Hong Kong Census Report 1991, there are more than half of the population in Hong Kong (about 3 million people) living in private housing buildings (Hong Kong Government, 1992). Private housing showed a great variety due to class difference. Most of the focus of study on private housing are on lower to middle class type. There are many problems existing in the private housing areas and building management problem is the most important issue. Firstly, there are so many complaints from residents who are unhappy with the sharp increase of management fee. Small flat owners organized actions to protest against such increase on the management fee. Secondly, there are also complaints about the deteriorating quality of life arising out of the decaying physical environment in private housing areas. Due to the lack of coordinated social planning in these residential areas, particularly in the old urban districts, many of the residents are living in overcrowded buildings with poor sanitation. Social services are also not readily available to them. Thirdly, there is a lack of mutual care and a sense of communal responsibility in private housing. Residents' involvement and participation in community affairs are usually low. This is reflected by the low voting rate in the 1991's election in the private housing areas (Sing Tao Daily 1991). Residents also know less neighbors compared with those residents

living in the public housing areas because of the building designs and the high mobility of residents' dwelling pattern.

It is generally perceived that the degree of social cohesion among the residents living in the private housing are very low. People living in private housing are more "private" than "communal", more apathetic than participative, and more inactive than initiative in community affairs.

The Hong Kong government puts a lot of resources to try to tackle the wide range of management problems in private housing in supporting the establishment of Owners' Incorporations (later referred as OIs) under the auspice of the City and New Territories Administration (later referred as CNTA). The CNTA send liaison officers to help OIs to elect their own representatives to supervise management companies under the legal power of the Deed of Mutual Covenant (later referred as DMCs). However, this top-down approach is found to be far from adequate in solving the multi-dimensional problems in private housing, especially problems of community integration and participation (Pahl, 1969; Rein, 1969; Gans, 1969; Cox, 1977). Therefore, many non-governmental organizations (later referred as NGOs) prefer to adopt a bottom-up approach focusing on the promotion of autonomous residents participation and neighborliness both as an end in itself and also as a problem-solving method. Governmental organizations cannot function flexibly in the mobilization of local residents, therefore the use of community development projects serves as an alternative intervention strategy to tackle the wide range of scope and size of the problems in private housing areas.

1.2 The community work approach

Private housing areas are generally considered as hard-to-reach areas - gates are usually locked, doors closed, faces cold and apathetic - which are very difficult to get residents organized. The living conditions in private housing areas have been the concern of many NGOs working in the community development field for some times in order to meet the social needs of the residents and promote mutual care and community development. NGOs have initiated community development projects in various private housing buildings. As early as in 1984, Hong Kong Council of Social Services has proposed study on the needs and feasibility of providing community services to private housing (HKCSS, 1984), and in the mid-80's there were a lot of exploratory efforts in this aspect (Leung, 1985; Lee, 1985; HKCSS, 1986; HKCSS, 1989; Cheng, 1989).

A study done by Hong Kong Council of Social Services in 1989 revealed that there were 11 projects covering 14 areas where the NGOs were providing various types of community development services in private housing buildings (HKCSS, 1989). More than half of these projects were started in 1986-1987, and public funds and professional social workers had been employed to stimulate community participation to solve the aforementioned community problems. This bottom-up approach which stresses more on the autonomy of the ordinary citizen is considered more flexible than the official method of coopting people into the established policies of the government, and community development operated by NGOs can achieve better social integration due to its neutral role while they are working with the government and resi-

dents on different social issues. Yet, there are very few evaluative researches conducted to assess their effectiveness in the communities they served.

In view of the rising need for professional and public accountability, it is appropriate time for the community work profession to assess the effectiveness of these programmes as well as the impact of community development in affecting the changes in respect of the desirable community development objectives.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the programme effectiveness of community development services provided by a Community Centre in a private housing community. The primary objective of this study is to investigate whether the implementation of community development services will produce programme effects on the basic elements of community -- participation, neighborliness, and sense of belonging -- for the residents living in private housing areas.

Secondly, it is hoped that this study can stimulate community workers' awareness and interests, as well as an objective understanding about their programme effectiveness. It hopes to arouse discussions about the choice of intervention strategies that community workers should adopt in facing particular unique community settings, as in the case of private housing in this study. And also, it hopes to suggest how the government can play her role successfully in confronting problems of management in private housing sectors in Hong Kong.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The present study aims at investigating the programme effectiveness of a social intervention strategy - community development - on a particular community, i.e. private housing in Hong Kong.

The main thrust of theoretical construct is therefore on community development, while private housing becomes an intervention object. One of the basic assumption of community development propounded by the Chicago School was that individual and collective behavior are affected by their environmental and social setting, and housing environment is fundamental in social relations within a given space. This does not mean that behavior is environmentally determined, but that social interactive behavior need to have necessary physical conditions for it to operate.

People living together in certain areas would naturally interact with each other and a common sentiment can be promoted if people get chances to be recognized in this territory. Further involvement in a problem solving process amongst the residents can help to promote their sense of belonging to their place. Yet, in some types of communities where seclusiveness is the norm, people do not "naturally" interact with one another. They need external stimulations in the promotion of this sentiment. And in this way, implementation of community development service could facilitate residents' participation in the problem solving process, with the result of

the promotion of neighborliness, and the sense of belonging.

In the present review of literature, we will firstly describe an understanding of the basic elements of community, which includes participation, neighborliness and sense of belonging. The concept of participation is related with action, while neighborliness and sense of belonging are concerned with experiential feelings. These elements constitute the focus of analysis, and changes in the levels of participation, neighborliness and sense of belonging are measurements of the effectiveness of the deliberate external efforts of community development services.

Secondly, we will try to focus on the community development approach that aims at intervening into the community and helps to change the basic elements inside. The nature, goals, and service areas of community development are described and analyzed, with particular reference to the Hong Kong setting. Furthermore, evaluation of the effectiveness of community development services in different types of communities are also analyzed so that, in analyzing its effectiveness in private housing, we can better understand the strengths and weaknesses of community development in different context.

Lastly, we will try to introduce the particularity of the private housing community. Ecological conditions brings forth special types of community problems and social restraints, and in this way demands for special community intervention methods. The unique community setting provides both the need of the provision of community development services, and also limitations that may confine the successful operation of these service programmes.

The three parts - basic elements of community, community development approach and private housing in Hong Kong - thus form the theoretical analysis on the effectiveness of community development services in the private housing in Hong Kong.

2.1. The basic concepts of community

As we trace back to the historical roots of the concept of community, no one can bypass Tonnies (1955) definition of Gemeinschaft (community) and Gesellschaft (society). Gemeinschaft refers to the form of human grouping marked by face-to-face, intimate, rich and deeply satisfying relationship. Gesellschaft describes associations that are contractual, calculating, impersonal and partial. Durkheim (1964) distinguishes between two types of social solidarity : mechanical and organic. Mechanical solidarity refers to a communal living which is based on moral and social homogeneity that are reinforced by the discipline of the small communities of closed proximity, and organic solidarity describes a social uniformity marked by organic articulation of free individuals pursuing different and diversified functions but united by their complementary roles. Nisbet (1966) further elaborates the community as "... a fusion of feeling and thought, of tradition and commitment, of membership and volition".

Feelings of fellowship, psychological ties and togetherness, thus form the basic element of community. Konig (1968) roundly asserts that in the strict sociological sense the phenomenon of spatial proximity and close social relationship of the neighborhood is inseparable from the idea of community.

Milson (1974) points out that there are at least four senses in which "community" may be used. Four social realities it may describe. Firstly, the small local community with many areas of common life. Secondly, an association of people with common life who do not live in the same neighborhood. Thirdly, localized and large associations but with little common life throughout. Fourthly, a social process. Two elements of community can be discerned : locality and social relationship, the mixture of which differentiates the different types of communities.

Some definitions on community highlight the "resident community" and "the community of interest" even though these two can be overlapped very often. Originally the term community denotes a collectivity of people who occupied a geographical area. However, the modern community, with more advanced communication and transportation technology, have made the boundaries of communities obsolete and irrelevant. This is not merely a recognition that the essence of the community is not guaranteed by geography alone, it goes further and suggests that there can be "community" among social groups who do not inhabit the same area. The idea of functional community thus has stretched far beyond geographical boundary, and put comradeship and feeling of integration as the focal point of analysis.

From the above literature, the community is not only a place for people living there but also involving some sentimental elements such as neighborhood relationship, sense of identification and feeling of integration.

With emphasis on the elements of locality and social relationships, a community is thus defined as a social group, generally localized, where there is manifest or latent, existent or potential, a sense of identification among the members: it is not simply a point on the map but an understanding to be found in people's attitudes and thinking. The community is the geography of social process, and very often these processes extend beyond its physical boundary, especially in the modern urban society (Anderson, 1981). It consists of participative activities, without which the community virtually does not exist; it encompasses a geographical area, within which the physical and housing setting provide the spatial conditions for social interaction, through the involving and joining the activities among the geographical setting, thus forming the concept of neighborhood; it envelopes feelings and psychological ties, therefore fermenting the development of a sense of belonging.

Participation, neighborliness and sense of belonging are thus, seen in this light, the basic elements of a community. Community development programmes, as an extraneous factor intervening into the natural community fibre, inevitably have to confront the challenges of promoting a participative spirit, a harmonious neighborly feeling, and a sense of belonging.

It is to these elements that we now turn to the concept of participation.

2.2. Participation

The UN "World Social Situation" Report (1982) in defining the content of activities relevant to social participa-

tion refers it as "the involvement of citizens in public affairs at various administrative and political levels of decision and through various means, from the casting of a ballot to the direct contribution to the satisfaction of community needs." What advances in the notion of participation is people's involvement in activities which affect them in their local communities. Participation covers a range of activities ranging from macro-level political organizations of a society to micro-level involvement in the local communities.

The term "participation" thus covers all forms of action by which citizens take part in the operation of administering their social life through various means (Soysal, 1965). It can work through political mechanisms, or through social and voluntary organizations, and very often the meanings and effects of political and social participation are fused together. For example, Stassen (1977) refers to participation as "the role of members of the general public, as distinguished from that of the appointed officials, including civil servants, in influencing the activities of government or in providing directly for community needs." According to Stassen, participation may occur on any level - from the neighborhood villages to the country as a whole. It may be only advisory in nature, as in the case of an advisory committee to a minister or head of a town hall, or it may involve decision making as in the case of governing bodies of local authorities, and it may extend to actual implementation, as it occurs when villagers decide to carry out a community self-help projects or work with voluntary welfare agencies, or it may be indirect, through elected

officials and representatives.

Arnstein (1969), as the theoretical master of community development in the concept of participation, suggests that a solution to the goal incompatibility dilemma of political and social participation lies in allowing for the free expression of pluralist citizen values. She adopts a social reformer's approach that aims to transfer a large share of decision power from the professionals to the citizen. Her definition of participation is a categorical term relating to citizen power. It is the redistribution of power that enables the have-nots, presently excluded from the political and economic processes, to be deliberately included in the future. Participation is the means by which the have-nots join in determining how social information is shared, goals and politics are set, tax resources are allocated, public programs are operated, and benefits like contracts and patronage are parceled out. In short, it is the means by which they can induce significant social reform which enables them to share in the benefits of the affluent society.

Arnstein further conceptualizes participation in terms of a "ladder" or typology of citizen participation with eight levels, and this have become a classic in the community development literature. From the bottom, these levels of participation are:

Nonparticipation which consists of "Manipulation" as in rubberstamp advisory committees, and "Therapy" where citizens are to be cured of their "pathology" through participation in groups.

Tokenism which consists of "Informing" where citizens are told of their rights and options; "Consultation" in which

citizens ideas are solicited through attitude surveys, neighborhood meetings, and public hearings; "Placation" where a few representatives of the poor powerless are placed on public boards.

Citizen Power is concerned with "Partnership" where citizens share planning and decision-making responsibilities through joint boards and decision rules; "Delegated power" in which citizens have dominant decision-making authority over a particular plan or program; and finally "Citizen control" where participants or residents govern a program or institution, are in charge of policy and management, and can negotiate any attempts at change by outsiders.

Participation is thus a term closely linked with the concept of power, through which the participant can achieve the goal of controlling their personal, social and political destiny. In social work, the term also has this double meaning of "social therapeutic" and "empowerment" effects on the individual (Burke, 1983; Jones, 1974; Curno, 1978) and political effects on public policies that affect their livelihood (Walters, 1987; Checkoway, 1986). In terms of the social work effects of participation, Rothman (1974) proposes three views. First, participation is sometimes spoken as a goal on its own right. The core objective of participation is the restoration of potential ties for meaningful human interaction. Secondly, participation is seen as a means for achieving more concrete programmatic ends. Hence, maximum participation of people represents a fundamental philosophical creed of practice for effective implementation of programs. Thirdly, participation is also viewed as a means, but as

a conditional means employed selectively for certain goals and under certain given circumstances.

The present study does not aim at separating the political and social meanings of participation since they are closely knitted with each other, therefore it encompasses the scope of participation in community activities, community organizations, and political elections. However, it focuses more on the social effects of participation, that is, the promotion of social integration and the feeling of togetherness. Neighborliness and sense of belonging, as community sentiment, will be stressed.

This does not belittle the political dimension of participation. It only shows that, as in the case of private housing in Hong Kong, participatory activities which were mobilized by NGOs do not manifest themselves in a political manner due to the operational mechanisms of a colonial consultative government in de-politicising the effects of participation (King, 1975; Miners, 1976). Through the inviting of politicians at different tiers of District Administration in the problem solving process on the housing management affairs. It can be treated as one form of the political participation. The overall political condition in Hong Kong does not allow citizen power to function in its full sense. Thus, Community development programmes, operating in the political context in Hong Kong, chiefly focus on the social effects and concrete problem-solving result that aim at the enhancement of social integration and immediate effects of policy changes. And in this way, neighborliness and sense of belonging become the foci of analysis.

2.3. Neighborliness

In relation to the concept of community, the term "neighborhood", however, has a more narrow and tangible meaning of a community attached to housing types. The characteristics of housing as a social phenomenon stresses heavily on how the environment influence the individual behaviors and the interrelatedness with each other. How people communicate with each other very often depends on the distance in between. The perception of space is dynamic because it is related to action - what can be done in a given space - rather than what is seen by passive viewing from outside (Hediger, 1955).

The Statistical Policy Division of the Office of Management and Budget (1973) interprets the neighborhood as an aspect of social relationship relating to housing quality. The term "neighborhood" is thus defined as attributes relating to convenience of living, conditions of housing, interpersonal support and safety within an immediate geographical environment, and "neighborliness" also refers to the feelings of convenience, safety, and support within the neighborhood. It is a kind of psychological satisfaction relating with a geographical and physical setting. The concept of "neighborliness" thus refers to the particular spatial and social relationships specific to local housing communities. Special spatial distance, for example, a communal living environment, can provide a potential background condition for the growth of communal social relationship.

Campbell (1981) describes the neighborhood as attributes of the physical quality and the extent how people know and associate with one another in a geographical area. He further

pointed out that socializing with one's neighbors is not entirely a matter of where one lives, it is also influenced by how long one has lived there. Generally speaking, the longer a person has lived in the same residence, the more likely he or she is to be on visiting terms with the people next door. Satisfaction with neighborhood is most strongly determined by the individual's perception of the condition of the neighborhood housing, of the friendliness of its residents, of its security from crime occurrence, and of the convenience to work and shopping. Campbell further concludes a significant degree of satisfaction with the three levels of environment - community, neighborhood, and housing. People who are satisfied with their neighborhood tend to be satisfied with their housing.

Campbell A, Converse P.E. and Rodgers W.L. (1976) also confirm that satisfaction with community was strongly related to satisfaction with the neighborhood, and satisfaction with neighborhood showed a strong relationship to housing satisfaction. Satisfaction with these domains of the environment are also related to satisfaction with other domains of life experience. Again, satisfaction with these residential environments as well as satisfaction with other domains of life experiences, are related to expressed satisfaction with life as a whole. Alwin et al (1986) highlight the close relationship between the neighborliness and social integration in their study on the "Living Arrangements and Social Integration." Again, Fried and Gleicher (1976) stress very much on the relationship among the neighborliness and the variables of feeling of belonging to some place, social relationships in physical space,

social classes as well as satisfaction with reference to the residential areas.

Neighborliness is thus a concept and a feeling attached with the immediate living and housing environment. Yet, human psychology is a very complicated matter, and very often emotions are mixed together to form a culture-bound gestalt whole that relates with local social institutions and organizations. The simple description of neighborliness without an in-depth understanding of the social complexity of the community is far from adequate in our analysis, and to this we turn to the concept of the sense of belonging in the community.

2.4. Sense of belonging

The sense of belonging is the psychological definition of community as against the territorial definition of community (Lyon, 1989). It is the kind of moral unity and wholeness emotions existing in community life that characterized this psychological relationship (Cox, 1987).

According to Ekman (1991), the sense of belonging involves both feelings and specific symbols. It means nearness to and experience of a place and also involves shared identity. Belonging is a subjective experience which one feels. However, feelings of belonging cannot be analyzed only by emotions alone, it is a kind of consciousness that one feels and interprets the environment. This local consciousness consists of shared knowledge and shared experience of both the social and the geographical environment which together combines the home area, people, territory and social meanings. Local consciousness can be

seen as an orientation to the world. It is a cumulative process, generated by historical experience and everyday relations. A territory is not purely physical to its inhabitants, it is imbued with symbols and meanings. Common culture is stored in the neighborhood through people's experiences in their physical and social environment, the home area. People remember their home area and the community not because of the buildings and facilities, they remember these places because they grew up there, played there, went to school there, or their parents died there. All these provide for cultural continuity. The community and the neighborhood can thus be seen as a mental construct and a group of sentiment that are related but not restricted by physical boundaries. It is a place where social norms germinate.

The depth of such belonging is revealed in the forms of social groupings and association in the community so that when a person is identified as belonging to a particular group or neighborhood, he becomes a member of the community as a whole of its cultural institutions. When people thus identify themselves as belonging to certain place they merge the primacy of their immediate groupings and neighboring associations with the community as a whole.

The normative understanding of the community and neighborhood ultimately brings us to the interpretation of institutions and roles. Morris (1984) takes five different types of roles to describe this psycho-social aspect of the community. The 'householder role' covers domestic maintenance functions like furnishing and gardening; the 'tenant role' relates with building management and amenities; the 'neighbor role' builds up norms and

neighborly cooperative behavior; the 'parental role' supervise social activities at home; and the 'residential community role' includes all activities relating to environmental amenities and the provision of social services. All these roles develop moral rights and obligations, social gives-and-takes, and conformity and deviance.

This further brings us to the assumption of roles in the community. The parental and householder roles are more domestic and protective, and community changes may be considered as intrusive to the order and security of the family. In this way, community participation becomes more on the defensive side and less open to changes. The tenant role and neighbor role are more opened up to and seeks collaborative relationship with the immediate environment, they assumed a more "outgoing" mode and thus build up a community culture of openness, mutual adjustment and collective consciousness. The residential community role is an ideal cherished by social thinkers and community organizers in advocating and mobilizing people to participate, yet the assumption of this role requires a deepseated and subconscious cultural continuity in the local context. The length of residential stability becomes a precondition of this role, and the highly mobile urban flow often disrupts the formation of this local consciousness.

2.5. A short conclusion

Participation, neighborliness, and sense of belonging have long since existed in human history and they are considered as the basic elements of an integrated society. Communities are

lost, neighborliness disappeared, people live in anomie and escapist states and active social participation dwindled to unsatisfactory levels. The desire for social integration calls for the assumption of altruistic roles in the revitalization of the community. Community is a powerful force that symbolize cohesiveness and collective strength, and it is in this context that community development projects are needed to involve people to participate, and to develop a sense of neighborliness and belonging.

The community's capacity to become functionally and emotionally integrated, to engage in cooperative problem solving process, and to engage in democratic participation is of central importance. Community development projects have to face this challenge of counteracting the disintegrating forces of urbanization, as Blakely (1979) succinctly described :

The community ... must be totally involved in all of the frustrations as well as the successes in arriving at the objective. It is in this process that growth in 'community' (relationships among people) occurs, and it is this process and not its outcome that stimulates and advances the science of community development.

2.6. Community development

Like the concept of "community", there is no widely accepted definition on "community development." Definitions of community development differ from country to country. Community development and community organization denote different meanings and methods under the term "community work" in United Kingdom and

the United States. The term community development virtually covers anything that is non-institutional.

One of the definition on the community development cited by Cary (1970) is a process of social action " ... in which the people of a community organize themselves for planning and action; define their common and individual needs and problems; make group and individual plans to meet their needs and solve their problems; execute these plans with a maximum reliance upon community resources; and supplement these resources when necessary with services and materials from governmental and non-governmental agencies outside the community".

Or it may be defined as the enablement of problem solving abilities, "... as a planned and organized effort to assist individuals to acquire attitudes, skills, and concepts required for their democratic participation in the effective solution of as wide as possible a range of community problems in an order of priority determined by their increasing levels of competence (Merirow, 1960)

Community development is also defined as an organized educational process which deals comprehensively with the community in its entirety, and with all of the various functions of community life as integrated parts of the whole. Thus the ultimate goal of community development is to help evolve through a process of organized study, planning, and action, a physical and social environment that is best suited to the maximum growth, development and happiness of human beings as individuals and as productive members of their society. (Poston, 1958)

It can also be defined as " ... the process by which the efforts of the people themselves are united with those of governmental authorities to improve the economic, social and cultural conditions of communities, to integrate these communities into the life of the nation, and to enable them to contribute fully to national progress. (United Nations, 1956).

This list of definitions could be endless, like Hillery's (1955) list of 94 definitions of the word "community". The main problem of definition lies in the ideological construct of a perfect society; of the contradictions between social values like democracy, equality and fraternity, liberty and social engineering; as well as conflict and harmony; and of the methods of social change and the roles and capacities of the informal sector, the voluntary sector and the public sector.

Some theoretician stresses on the strengthening of social harmony through self-help and mutual-help activities (Ross, 1955; Warren, 1962), while some are more reformist in taking up conflict and militant pressures to bring about policy changes (Biddle, 1965; Alinsky, 1971), while some others prone towards a broader structural change in the adjustment of class relationship (Mayo, 1975; Cowley, 1977; Baldock, 1977).

Some theoreticians derives models of community development, as with Rothman's (1979) three models (locality development, social planning and social action), or Hyman's (1986) six models (traditional planning, advocacy planning, locality development, social action, bureaucratic management and management of innovation), or Hodge's (1969) four interpretive aspects (administrative aspects, urban aspects, political aspects and economic

aspects).

Henderson (1980) points out the inherent conflicts of community development : the culture of community work is predominantly public-oriented, the process of doing community work is worker-led, and the methodological approach to change is we-centred. This has clarified a lot of misunderstanding about the operation and also the effectiveness of community development. The culture and method of community development is participation, but the worker can direct participation according to his/her own values. The complexities of community development are thus in the workers themselves. Lambert (1978) thus classified four types of community workers : the conservatives, the liberals, the socialists and the anarchist, and described how these political values affect the direction and effectiveness of community development.

The present study does not attempt to go into an in-depth analysis of the dynamic conflicts of community development in Hong Kong, especially within the private housing area. For brief clarity, community development is defined as an overall term describing the activities of local residents, organizations, voluntary agencies and governmental bodies in solving community problems; improving services, facilities and environmental conditions; promoting the quality of life and the channels of communication between government and its people; and a decentralization of decision making power and a democratization of the polity (Leung, 1985). Under this umbrella term, numerous activities can be initiated and implemented : the formation of local residents organizations, the provision of social and recreational services, enhancement of self-help activities,

promotion of mass education and residents training, encouragement of volunteer work, coordination of the efforts and resource of local authorities, or the call for protest actions that demand for government service provisions.

In fact, community development activities can be performed by self-conscious volunteers, political groups, governmental agencies or local residents groups. As a means, community development could facilitate peoples' participation, interaction and identification towards the community. As an end, community development would like to achieve its goals through the participation process. A historical review and the effectiveness of community development services in Hong Kong were presented as follow.

2.7 Community development services in Hong Kong

According to Hong Kong Council of Social Services (1986), community development service, however, is a more narrow term describing the conscious efforts of social organizations, usually governmental bodies and voluntary agencies, in achieving the following objectives:

- (1) the provision of social welfare services in the community,
- (2) the enhancement of community participation and integration of the residents.

The first objective is a tangible and specific one and its effectiveness can be easily measured by the activities performed and the number of recipients and their satisfaction of the services provided, but the second objective is a more general and intangible one that describe the general change of attitudes of

local residents concerning about their livelihood in the community. The first objective is focused on the performance of the service agency and relates to the specific tasks/services involved (e.g. organizing an information-dissemination mass meeting, a picnic, or services rendered in a community crisis), and the response of service recipients made to the service. Participation has a more narrow sense of participating in a service performance, rather than a "community participation". The second objective is centred on the activation, strength, pattern and development of community interaction upon the stimulation of the community service agency. The service agency is only the prelude to a chorus of community interaction by which it does not have effective control, and it should not be the focus of analysis. What is important is the process of interaction involved during the provision of the services which released the strength the community potential.

Community development services has a relatively short history of development in Hong Kong. Community development services are mainly managed by the Home Affairs Department (which later changed its name to City and New Territories Administration) and the Social Welfare Department, and in this way served only the functions of local administration and social welfare service provision. However, the lack of community development in the urban policy-making bodies had somehow forced community development services in the social welfare field to enter into this arena and perform functions related with urban management and development..

Voluntary community development agencies in Hong Kong thus have to permeate their activities across the functions of mobilization of local constituency for local administration, providing social welfare services, and enhancing problem solving abilities in local housing and urban management.

The historical development of community development services in Hong Kong witnessed the abovementioned features. Before the 1966 and 1967 riots, the 1965 Social Welfare White Paper defined the function of community development purely as moral consolidation for social stability (Chow, 1980).

Hong Kong Council of Social Service had proclaimed its own community development position papers in 1976, 1981 and 1986 respectively. In 1976, Hong Kong Council of Social Services put up a Position Paper on community development services describing six categories under community development, which are: (1) negotiating for environmental improvements, (2) participating in the making of social policies, (3) improving on the daily lives of residents through self-help programmes, (4) improving quality of life in poor areas through mutual-help services, (5) promoting civic responsibility and social responsibility to the community, and (6) coordinating services of governmental, voluntary and community bodies. The 1981 Position Paper recommended the extension of service to new immigrants, industrial workers, town planning matters, and the improvement of the channels of grievances (HKCSS, 1983). It further suggested extending services to private housing areas and old public housing estates, the formalization of planning procedures between the Government and the Non-governmental organizations (HKCSS, 1986).

However, the focus of development of community work for Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Hong Kong was mainly on the Neighborhood Level Community Development Projects (NLCDPs) in squatter areas and Temporary Housing Areas, and community centres serving in derelict public housing estates. There was an agreed division of labor between the government and the NGOs, while the former provides the financial resources for the NGOs and only minimal direct services, the latter would focus on the "pocket communities" that are marginal in nature. Problems in private housing was not a policy priority. Yet, NGOs which were more sensitive to the problems of urban living had stimulated awareness on this issue in the early 80s, and community development services for private housing in urban areas became a ground for exploration and experimentation. Since 1986, the Community Development Division of Hong Kong Council of Social Services had formed a coordinating committee on Service Development to coordinate community development services in private housing areas, and in 1989 there were already 11 projects launched by different NGOs in private housing buildings. Throughout the years of services in the private housing, there were however no significant studies to assess the effectiveness of the community development in the private housing. It is time for the profession to look into the situation if the outcomes of community development could be achieved by the provision of community development services.

2.8. Evaluation studies in community development in Hong Kong

In Hong Kong, there are very few programme evaluation

researches on community development. For the private housing areas, there is no evaluation study done so far. One of the earliest study on programme effectiveness of the community development projects in Hong Kong is Chan's (1976) study on "Community Development in the Hong Kong Housing Estates". The Social Welfare Department (1979), Kwok (1979) and Lam (1987) also conducted different kinds of evaluation study on the community development in different types of housing areas but not in private housing areas at all.

Chan's evaluation research (1976) on the community development efforts of the voluntary agencies in the public housing estates was to understand the nature of their community work practices and evaluate the programme effectiveness and community impact of these project. His research findings have shown that the community development projects have only limited impact on the residents' awareness of community problems, cooperative spirit, leadership development and recreation within the community. However, there were greater programme impact on the individual participants on their problem solving ability, knowing more people, attention to community problems, attitudes changes, and increase on knowledge.

The major objective of Social Welfare Department's study in Tse Wan Shan Housing Estate (1976) was to establish a system of evaluation of effectiveness and impact of community development programme in relation to input and output. The findings of the survey found that the project, in general, was able to achieve the desired effects as specified in the output variable. Improvements were found in the consolidation of

neighborliness and the promotion of self help activities among residents, in staff contact with residents, in communication and joint efforts with other agencies, in involvement of volunteers in community programmes and the formation of developmental groups to initiate and promote community programmes.

Kwok's study (1979) on the Tai O Community Development Project aimed at measuring the programme effectiveness in respect to the five goals of the project, namely, to promote neighborliness, quality of life, community identity, citizen participation and civic responsibility. The findings of this study showed that there was no significant differences between the control and experimental groups in terms of all indicators used to measure outcomes. The conclusion stated that the Tai O Community Development Project was not effective in achieving its stated goals.

The survey results of Lam's study (1987) in Tai Hom (North) Village found out that the implementation of Neighborhood Level Community Development Projects (NLCDPs) related significantly to resident participation and community improvement. The influence of NLCDPs intervention was only moderately related to community attitude formation. Other socio-demographic variables, such as the plan of stay and years of residence in the village, have more significant impact on community attitudes than the implementation of community development programmes.

From the above studies, we can easily discern contradictions in the research findings on programme effectiveness of community development services. The SWD survey and Lam's study showed more positive programme effectiveness,

whereas Chan's and Kwok's study were not so promising. Taking extraneous factors into account, the SWD survey and Chan's survey were both conducted in public housing areas, yet they showed marked contradictions in their findings; Kwok's study in village areas was also in contradiction to Lam's study in the squatter areas. It seems that, as is shown by the results of these surveys, the community context do serve as an underlying factor in determining the growth and extent of neighborliness and participation, but how far does this underlying factor facilitates and obstructs the flow of community spirit is still a puzzle to be answered.

From the local experiences, it was found that the measurements for the goals of community development were relatively difficult, both the above-mentioned studies were stressed on the outcomes --Neighborliness, Participation and Sense of Belonging.

In this study, we also agree that measuring the goals of community development projects is not feasible. Outcome study on "Participation", "Neighborliness", and "Sense of belonging" is still our objective. We would compare the differences of perceptions of residents in two private housing estates in the same area where one received services of community development by Caritas but the other with no such professional intervention.

2.9 Private housing in Hong Kong

Compared with the public housing and squatter areas, the problems of private housing areas are quite different and unique. Different housing types have their own distinct problems

in private housing areas. Overall speaking, the major problem areas of the private housing areas are those problems relating to building management, poor environmental conditions, inadequate welfare services, low level of community involvement and participation as well as complicated legal responsibilities on management affairs.

According to a study done by Hong Kong Council of Social Service (1990), people living in the private housing buildings are facing different kinds of problems. They include air pollution, noise pollution, insufficient sewage disposal, presence of illegal structures such as illegal planting area, cage building, and outer wall installation and undesirable security measures. They were hazardous to human hygiene, fire and structural safety and are often a nuisance to the neighborhood. Some buildings are used for recreational centres, brothels (一樓一鳳), steam bath, billiard rooms and illegal occupation. These establishments not only dampen the image of these buildings but also pose threats to residents living in such blocks.

Another serious environmental problems in private housing areas concerning about the maintenance and repair of communal facilities including pumping and piping disorder, damage of fire hose/fire extinguishers, close circuit and black out. These problems cause much inconvenience and insecurity to residents of the building.

Older private residential areas are seldom self-sufficient in terms of community facilities. There is lack of open space and adequate community facilities for residents living there. Residents have to go out of the district for open space,

recreation and community facilities, and this affects the resident's sense of belonging to the community. In addition, residents of the older blocks often suffer from the composite problems of overcrowding due to partition of the flats, unlawful structure addition or alteration. These might add to potential physical dangers that may cost lives and is also vulnerable to crime.

Other than the physical problems, social welfare services in private housing areas, particularly in the older private housing areas, are generally inadequate. Neither are there available physical spaces to add new services on the spot. Some of the older private building tend to be overcrowded with high concentration of elderly, young people and sometimes new arrival families. Another serious problem hinder the development of residents' participation is the apathetic attitude and poor interpersonal relationship among residents in private housing. There is generally a lack of mutual concern and civic mindedness among residents, particularly in middle class housing blocks, which greatly impede the solving of building management problems in these buildings.

Suffering from the above physical and social problems, the management of the private housing would be the most important task for residents to deal with their own difficulties. If the building management could cope effectively with the problems they faced, there would become less serious in the physical and social problems.

The problems of building management for residents living in the private housing areas include monitoring building

management companies, supervision of watchman, finance control, complaints handling, arrears of management fee, problems of corruption of the owners' committee, inadequate work or facilities of the resident association and problems arising from multi-ownership management. Much of the skills and knowledge in building management depend upon the motivation and knowledge of individual owners and the effectiveness and function of the Owner's Committee. The Building Management Coordination Team of the Government can only tackle a limited extent of the many facets of building management problems.

Currently, there are several relevant Ordinances that are applicable to multi-storey buildings, such as Building Ordinance, Fire Service Ordinance, Multi-storey Building ordinance, etc., but they are written in complicated legal languages that few can understand. There is a need to provide assistance, advice, encouragement and training to residents so as to enhance their understanding and to enable them to participate in building management.

However, the most serious problem is the legal responsibilities and rights arising from the Deed of Mutual Covenant (DMC). Although guidelines have been issued to lawyers for interpreting and drafting the new DMCs since 1987, there are still loopholes not yet tackled by the guidelines, for example, the use of common parts including "right granted" to individual co-owner, and the restriction of use on exclusive areas, which often generate conflicts and misunderstandings between landlord, owner-occupiers, and resident associations. Again, the newly drafted DMCs were only applicable to those buildings built after

1987 and no retrospective effects to those DMCs existed before 1987. It was found that the majority of the private housing buildings could not cope with their own problems through the proper building management (HKHAA, 1987). Both Government and Non-government Organizations put much resources into this area in order to help residents in the private housing to tackle them. Details of these effort would be discussed later.

After reviewing the problems of existing private housing areas, we would like to draw some references from the environmental psychology and housing to understand how people were affected by the physical setting where they lived as well as how the sentimental attributes were influenced by that kind of environmental factors.

2.10 Housing and social interaction

Housing is not purely a space within four walls, but is a social phenomenon in which its residents have access to and interact with its environment. The characteristics of housing should thus be also interpreted in terms of on environmental psychology which stresses heavily on how the environments influence the individual behaviors and the interrelatedness with each other. How people perceive and interact with one another within a physical and social distance. The perception of space is dynamic because it is related to action - what can be done in a given space - rather than what is seen by passive viewing. (Hediger; 1955)

Moos and Insel (1974) provided a six dimensional analysis of how human environments can be conceptualized and

assessed. These are ecological dimensions, which include both geographical and physical design factors; behavioral settings, organizational structure; the collective personal and/or behavioral characteristics of the milieu inhabitants; immediate psychosocial climates, and functional or reinforcement factors of environments. These factors serve to promote or inhibit certain types of human behaviors.

Emphasizing on learned situational personalities, Hall (1969) suggested the simplest form of the situational personality is associated with responses to intimate, personal, social, and public transactions. Environmental conditions defined activity patterns, though passive, and communal facilities can provide sufficient factors for the growth of collective efforts. Some individuals never develop the public phase of their personalities and therefore, cannot fill public spaces; they make very poor speakers or moderators.

Cassirer (1944) conceptualized three fundamentally different types of spatial experience, the lowest order was organic or active space, the second order, perceptual space, and the highest order was symbolic or abstract space. Werner (1948) develops the organismic - developmental theory treats the development of space from action-in-space to perception-of-space to conceptions-about-space as a function of increasing differentiation, distancing, and reintegration between the organism and its environment.

People would live happily in their environments if all the things were solved properly. Unfortunately, problems were not easily tackled by the residents alone. It needs help from the

outsiders. The community development profession served as a change agent to offer help to residents in order to achieve the desirable goals.

CHAPTER III

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND OPERATIONAL DEFINITION

Human behaviors will be affected by the physical setting. Residents living in the private housing areas are also affected by housing facilities and neighbor interaction. The major problem areas of the private housing are those problems relating to building management, poor environmental conditions, inadequate welfare services, low level of community involvement and participation as well as complicated legal responsibilities on management affairs. Living in the private housing areas, residents are expected not only to solve their problems relating to the environment but also to manage well in different aspects such as finance, personnel, and relationship among various interest parties.

Community development services are most likely promote residents' participation in community affairs, particularly in this case housing management, neighborliness and sense of belonging. In this study, we predict that residents in two private housing estates in the same area will behave differently when one housing estate had been under community development intervention while the other receiving none.

There will be a more harmonious community if all the community problems were tackled and solved properly. Also, community should not only be treated as a geographic area in which people live but also a place for residents to build up the feeling of fellowship, togetherness as well as psychological ties.

Konig (1968) also points out that in the strict sociological sense the phenomenon of spatial proximity and close social relationship of the neighborhood is inseparable from the idea of community.

Hypotheses

The major purpose in this study is to compare if there are differences on the community development outcomes-- residents' participation, neighborliness, and sense of belonging-- for the residents when they are provided the community development services in comparing with those residents without such provision.

To be more specific, three hypotheses are put forward as follow:

1. The higher degree of resident's participation will be found in the private housing with the implementation of the community development services.
2. The higher degree of neighborliness among the residents will be found in the private housing with the implementation of the community development services.
3. The higher degree of sense of belonging towards the community will be found in the private housing with the implementation of the community development services.

3.1 Definition of concepts

3.1.1 Participation

Participation is seen not only as a wide range of activities from joining an activity to obtaining decisional power

but also activities relating to any level from neighborliness to community as a whole.

The measurement of this major variable is developed with reference to some researches. Voth (1975) stresses that the principal way to measure resident participation will be "the degree of participation in formal politics e.g. party activities, registration, voting, running for office, and the activities of voluntary association".

Oslen (1970) also lists out 15 indexes for measurement to social and political participation which include voluntary association membership, voluntary association participation, political news exposure, community activities, cultural events, church participation, friend interaction, relative interaction, political discussion, registration and voting, partisan political activities, partisan political involvement and governmental contact.

Chapin (1939) in studying the person's participation in community groups and institutions, lists out five aspects of participation on his social participation scale. His measurement of participation consists of membership in associations, attendance at meetings, financial contributions, membership on committees and offices held. Parker (1983) suggests an extension of Chapin's scale to include measurement on the numbers of meetings attended, hours outside meetings that are spent on the activities of the organization, and performing activities and duties on behalf of the organization.

Yuen (1984), in her study on Tai Hing Estate, considers four groups of activities indicative of citizen participa-

tion, namely, contacting local officials regarding community problems, activities held by community organizations, community improvement campaign activities and community mass social activities.

Many studies of participation have found that the degree of people's participation in community affairs is related to their socio-demographic characteristics. Foskett (1955) reports that "people in different educational, income or age categories hold differential positions in the social system and, thereby, come to have differential behavior patterns, including a tendency to participate or not participate in community affairs". Angell (1956) also finds out that there were significant differences between individuals regarding participation in community affairs related to certain predispositions. Such differences are found with respect to age, income, occupation, education, race, and length of residence in a community.

Apart from the above early studies, many recent studies on community participation further elaborate on the significance of various socio-demographic factors such as place of origin, length of residence, anticipation of residence, socio-economic status, age, sex and marital status in affecting the pattern of participation of the individuals in community activities. (Oslen, 1970,; Dauigellis, 1978). Therefore, in this study, some socio-demographic factors will be used as control variables to look into participation in many social and political activities. Participation is defined as residents' involvement in the building management and community affairs in the proximity of residents' living environment.

3.1.2 Neighborliness

Rothman (1974) highlights the close relationship between the participation and the human interaction. Neighborliness refers both attributes relating to the conditions of housing, communal living environment, association with one another in a geographical area and interpersonal support, satisfaction with other domains of life.

Alwin et al (1986) take the number of neighbors known by name and neighbor contact as the measures of "Social Integration" in their study on the "Living Arrangements and Social Integration." Campbell (1976) also takes five attributes of their neighborhood as assessment which are: convenience, how well neighboring houses are kept up, neighbors, personal safety for walking outside at night, and the importance of neighbors looking after their houses when others are away for brief period.

Fried and Gleicher (1976) reveal that the variables of feeling of belonging some place, social relationships in physical space, social classes as well as satisfaction with reference to the residential areas are important factors to neighborliness.

Kan (1974) uses "causal" and "crisis-related" neighborliness to distinguish two types of neighborly interaction in public housing estates. Causal Neighborliness is characterized by the overt, habitual and spontaneous forms of social interaction such as mutual visiting in homes and going out for purposes of pleasure. "Crisis Neighborliness" is characterized by favorable attitudes towards neighbors which result in positive action when a need arise, especially in times of crisis.

The "Causal Neighborliness" is measured by the frequency and extent (numbers) of neighborly contacts and intensity of neighborly relations. Whereas the "Crisis-Related Neighborliness" is measured by the items that neighbors as sources of help in personal and familial crises, the strength of neighborly cooperation in handling maintenance problems in housing estates, as well as the strength of neighborly cooperation in helping neighbors whose lives and property are in jeopardy.

Neighborliness is defined as the interactional behavior among neighbors and residents' attitudes towards neighborhood relations.

3.1.3 Sense of Belonging

Sense of belonging is described not only in terms of psychological relationship but also territorial aspect. Ekman (1991) suggests belonging as a subjective experience which people feel. It referred the nearness to and experience of a place and also involved shared identity. Cohen (1991) and Morris (1965) both stressed the neighborliness was one form of identity to cultivate the sense of belonging.

There are very few literature that aims at measuring the sense of belonging. People often confused neighborliness with the sense of belonging. The collective identity and community feeling are frequently confused with friendly relations in the immediate neighborhood. For example, Wong's study (1987) on the sense of belonging of residents in public housing estates in Shatin is very much concerned with personal network and local

community attachment. The results show that local social bonds was a very weak correlation with one's local community attachment. Wong's study finds that two variables, namely, length of residence and local organization participation, assert indirect effects on local community attachment. One's satisfaction with the environment is related firstly with local community attachment, followed by neighborliness, length of residence, local organization participation. These findings showed that the sense of belonging is much larger and extends beyond the immediate spatial social relationship. Neighborliness could only serve as a "path" to the larger cultural continuity within a given space. These indicators are exploratory in nature and are not meant to be exclusive, but they show a preliminary attempt to describe the "community of sentiment" which is a basic element of the community.

Sense of belonging in this study will be defined as sentimental elements and feeling towards the community such as a sense of pride of belonging to a community, the concern of community problems, the satisfaction with the living environment, the feeling of continuity within the community, a community identity, and the sense that one can act to change things in the community.

3.2 Operational definitions

3.2.1 Community Development

Community development was defined as a professional term that refers to the community approach of social work which centres on organizing collective efforts in problem solving processes to satisfy local needs.

3.2.2 Community Centre

Community centre was defined as an establishment providing community development services within defined boundary serving 100,000 people in Hong Kong.

3.2.3 Private housing:

Private housing was defined as the permanent houses built by private developers on Crown Land in Hong Kong. This is different from public housing estates, temporary huts, rooftop temporary huts or cottage areas which are classified under other categories in the Hong Kong Census Report. A private housing community thus means residents living within a defined private housing territory.

3.2.4 Community development services

Operationally, the term community development services in this study was defined as the programmes operated by the Caritas - Ngau Tau Kok Community Centre in Li Kei Building.

The Caritas - Ngau Tau Kok Community Centre provided community development services to the experimental group - Li Kei Building from 1989. The major working objectives of the community development services provided by the Community Centre--Caritas are to assist the residents in solving the building management problems; to assist the residents knowing more about the building management knowledge and decision making process; to enhance the residents' concern and participation in the problem solving process and the quality of life in the building; and to enhance the residents' neighborliness and their sense of belonging in the community.

The intervention strategies and inputs of community development services of the Caritas - Ngau Tau Kok Community Centre were presented as follow:

1. Exploration stage (3/89--11/89)

Workers paid visits to Mutual Aid Committees to build up relationship and provide recreational activities to the residents. A survey on the living environments was conducted.

2. Pre-formation stage (12/89--2/90)

To assist MAC for preparing the AGM to set up the Owners' Corporation. A talk on owners' rights and building management was organized. The survey report was distributed to the residents. The Community Centre also explored and identified legal advice resources to the building.

3. Crisis Intervention stage (3/90--6/90)

Since the management company proposed an unreasonable charge for replacement of water pipe, the workers organized owners' conference to discuss the issue and formed a monitoring group to examine the expenditures. In order to facilitate the communication among the residents, a communication network and block representatives scheme was introduced.

4. Mobilization stage (7/90--8/90)

Some recreational activities was provided for residents. Some newsletters and pamphlets were published regularly as a communication channel. Workers paid home visits and identified active residents. Some core group members were threatened by management company. Finally, an Owners' Corporation was set up.

3.2.5 Participation

The participation in building management is operationally defined as the residents' awareness of the Owners Incorporation and Deed of Mutual Covenant and its related activities, the accessibility to decision making bodies and residents involvement in the problem solving process in the building issues as well as attitudes towards building management and the Building. The Community participation will be measured by the participation in associations, community activities, election and related activities

3.2.6 Neighborliness

The neighborliness in this study is operationally defined as the number of neighbors greeted, chatted, offered helps, know their surnames, attitudes towards neighborhood relations as well as the frequency of neighbor interaction.

3.2.7 Sense of belonging

Sense of belonging to the community in this study is operationally defined as: attitudes towards their own Buildings

and problem solving process in the building. The indicators for measuring the sense of belonging are "cooperativeness to improve problems", "satisfaction towards the building", "perception on the building", "reaction to social award to the building", "relatedness of the building affairs", "concerning about the building", "feeling towards living and leaving the building", "sense of capability in solving problems" and "willing to serve for the building"

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The research methodology of this study was a survey study to find out the programme effectiveness of the Community Development Services (CDSs) of a Community Centre for residents living in the private housing areas.

An experimental design study with random sampling to compare the differences of programme effects of CDSs for residents with or without CDSs provision should be a better design. However, in reality, there were practical difficulties in the use of experimental design to evaluate the programme effects of CDSs for residents living in the private housing areas because we could not put all the residents into an artificial situation for study. In fact, there would be also the problem of getting a real control group for community development activities since the natural communities were often dynamic and expose to extraneous influences. The comparison of two group was used in this study because Caritas has just provided community development services to one of the two housing estates in the same area for more than 2 years. As the researcher had not involved in the project. A before and after test of the residents could not be carried out. Only outcome evaluation could be done.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

With the limitations discussed above, the Ex Post Facto Design (Kerlinger, 1973) was used. The Ex Post Facto design

focuses on "from what is done afterward. It meant work done after the intervention of community development with a retroactive effects on the outcome measurements--residents' participation, neighborliness and sense of belonging. Under this design, the independent variables have already existed, the manipulation or assignment of subjects to the experimental and control groups were practically and ethically impossible.

Two groups, one being the experimental group exposed to the implementation of CDSs and the other being the comparison group without such CDSs provision, were constructed.

The basic weakness of the Ex Post Facto design was the assumption of equal independent variables among two groups other than the intervention variable. As review before, some disposition variables that were related to the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents would affect the outcomes. These variables will statistically control to minimize the influences. They include:

1. Age
2. Sex
3. Education Level
4. Income
5. Years of residence in the building
6. Years of residence in Ngau Tau Kok
7. Economic status
8. Plan of stay in the building

4.2 POPULATION OF THE STUDY

The target population of this study was limited to the

flat owners and/or its spouse of Lee Kei Building (experimental group) and Wan Kwong House (control group) in Ngau Tau Kok. The choice of this private housing areas for study was a purposeful one. The Lee Kei Building and Wan Kwong House are located side by side in Ngau Tau Kok. Community development service was provided to the Lee Kei Building and Wan Kwong House received none. In terms of the physical, social, environmental factors, these two building provided the best samples for this study.

According to the information provided by the Caritas-Hong Kong, the Centre provided services to Lee Kei Building since 1989. There were about 576 households in Lee Kei Building. In Wan Kwong House, there were about 648 households living there. They were the population for both experimental and control groups.

4.3 SAMPLING

A sample of 100 was randomly selected from Lee Kei Building as the experimental group and another sample of 100 was also randomly selected from Wan Kwong House to serve as the control group. The method of simple random sampling was used in selecting samples.

The unit for interview was the flat owners of the household. Within each household, the household flat owner or its spouse was selected for interview. Replacement was made if the interviewer fail to contact sampled household for three times. The replacement list was also randomly selected. There were totally 180 samples completed in this study.

4.4 RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Data for this study were collected through administering a standardized questionnaire by means of personal interviews. In order to minimize the biases yielded by the interviewers, most of the questions on the schedule were of a closed-end format with predetermined response categories. The questionnaire consisted of several sets of information with a total of 52 questions. (See the appendix)

4.5 TRAINING OF INTERVIEWERS

About 15 interviewers were recruited from the CPHK, Baptist College and HKP to carry out the interviews. Most of these interviewers have had experiences in conducting interviews for social studies.

A training programme was given to them for familiarizing the questionnaire. Some photographs showing the physical environment of these two buildings were provided for interviewers during the training sessions. The interviewers were also requested to distribute the appointment letters of the survey to the households before the interviews.

4.6 PRE-TEST

A pre-test on 14 households was completed in February, 1992. The data collected were used for the reliability test. In fact, the pre-test found useful and helpful for the above purposes. Some of the questions were rephrased for easy understanding of interviewees and interviewers respectively. It is also found that most interviewees were easily contacted in evenings

and on Sundays. Each interview took about thirty minutes to finish.

4.7 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

For the test on the validity and reliability, a questionnaire was sent to those experienced community workers with at least one year community work experience in private housing areas for their comments on the acceptance of the items in the questionnaire as the measuring indicators for the community development outcomes. There were 17 returns out of the total 25 number of questionnaire. Most of them accept and show support to the questionnaire items. The content validity of the questionnaire items was achieved.

Concerning the reliability of the study, an alpha test was performed on the 14 pretest cases. The overall alpha value scored at 0.55. This showed adequate internal consistency of the questionnaire.

4.8 DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

The actual interviews took place in six consecutive weeks from March to April 1992. Each interviewer was required to report to the field supervisor whenever they went out for work.

Including 38 replacement cases, a total of 180 questionnaires were completed within the designated period of field work. All the questionnaires were checked and inspected by the field supervisor before they were returned for coding.

4.9 DATA PROCESSING AND ANALYSIS

Among 180 completed cases, only 174 questionnaires were valid, 90 for the experimental group and 84 for the control group. When analyzing the data, Statistical Package for Social Science X (SPSSX) was used. The data processing procedures were conducted up to May, 1994. The coded data were analyzed in accordance with the purposes and specific research questions of the present study.

CHAPTER V

PROFILE OF THE TWO SAMPLE GROUPS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the profile of the two sample groups in order to understand whether the results would be affected by the different characteristics of the residents in terms of the socio-demographic factors.

Chi-square tests were used to test whether the two groups were statistically significant on the various socio-demographic factors. The significant level is set at 0.05. The profile of the respondents are presented in the following tables.

Table I: Sex difference of the respondents

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
Male	42	46.7	42	50.0
Female	48	53.3	42	50.0
Total	90	100.0	84	100.0
Chi square = 0.19	df = 1		p = ns	

There was almost an equal number of male and female respondents of the two sample groups being interviewed in this study. The female respondents in the experimental group were slightly more than those respondents in the control group. The Chi-square test showed no significant difference on sex difference between these two sample groups.

Table II. Years of residence of the respondents
in the building

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
Under 2 years	26	28.9	10	11.9
2 to 7 years	27	30.0	28	33.3
8 to 12 years	20	22.2	22	26.2
over 12 years	17	18.9	24	28.6
Total	90	100.0	84	100.0

Chi square = 8.22 df = 3 p < .05

There was statistical difference between the two sample groups in terms of the residents' years of residence in their own buildings. The study results could be affected by this variable. It was important for this study to find out the pure effects of CDSs on the community development outcomes in control of this socio-demographic factor. Therefore, a statistical control on this variable was introduced. After reviewing all the 174 cases from both sample groups, 2 cases from the experimental group and 12 cases from the control group that were over 15 years of residence in the buildings were taken out in order to control the effect of the years of residence in the building. In effect, 88 cases and 72 cases in the experimental and control groups were taken for further analysis.

Table III. Years of residence of the respondents in the district

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
Under 2 years	17	18.9	1	1.2
2 to 7 years	14	15.6	24	28.6
8 to 12 years	22	24.4	23	27.4
13 to 17 years	17	18.9	20	23.8
18 to 22 years	2	2.2	12	14.3
Over 22 years	18	20.0	4	4.8
Total	90	100.0	84	100.0
Chi square = 33.00 df = 5 p < .05				

There was statistical difference between the two sample groups with regard to the years of residence in the district. However, comparing to the years of residence in the building, this factor would have indirect effects on programme results of the community development outcomes. Therefore, no statistical control was taken for this socio-demographic factor since the study has statistically controlled on the effect of the years of residence in the building. The analysis will also base on the above statistical control.

Table IV. Age of the respondents

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
20 to 29	19	21.1	9	10.7
30 to 39	23	25.6	33	39.3
40 to 49	24	26.7	18	21.4
50 to 59	17	18.9	11	13.1
60 and above	7	7.8	13	15.5
Total	90	100.0	84	100.0

Chi square = 9.10 df = 4

p = ns

The study found no statistical difference between the two sample groups in terms of the age structure of the residents. Most of the respondents were in their middle age between the 30-49.

Table V Education level of the respondents

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
No formal education	7	7.8	5	6.0
Primary school	24	26.7	19	22.6
Secondary school				
Lower form (F.1-F.3)	22	24.4	18	21.4
Upper form (F.4-F.7)	28	31.1	31	36.9
Post-secondary school or University	9	10.0	11	13.1
Total	90	100.0	84	100.0
Chi square = 1.46	df = 4		p = ns	

From the table above, we might find that the residents of the two sample groups had similar education background. There was also no significant difference between the two sample groups under this socio-demographic factor at 0.05 level of confidence. Generally speaking, over 30% of the residents in both groups obtained upper form secondary schooling. One-tenth of them have received post-secondary or University education.

Table VI Economic Status of the respondents

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
Full-time employment	61	67.8	50	59.5
Part-time employment	5	5.6	6	7.1
No employment	24	26.7	28	33.3
Total	90	100.0	84	100.0
Chi square = 1.28	df = 2		p = ns	

The result showed that the economic status of the two groups of residents were similar. The majority of the residents were employed as a full time worker, accounting for 67.8% and 59.9% of the experimental group and the control group accordingly. The Chi-square test showed no significant difference between the two sample groups.

Table VII Personal monthly income of the respondents

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
No income	22	24.4	29	34.5
Below \$1,500	2	2.2	2	2.4
\$1,501 to \$3,000	3	3.3	3	3.6
\$3,001 to \$6,000	14	15.6	16	19.0
\$6,001 to \$9,000	29	32.2	18	21.4
\$9,001 to \$12,000	9	10.0	9	10.7
\$12,001 to \$15,000	3	3.3	4	4.8
\$15,001 & above	3	3.3	3	3.6
Unknown	5	5.6	0	0.0
Total	90	100.0	84	100.0
Chi Square = 4.79	df = 8		p = ns	

Similar to the result found in the economic status,

there was no significant difference in the residents' personal monthly income between the two sample groups. The median monthly income for the residents in both sample groups was around \$6000.

Table VIII Plan to move out

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
Have	22	24.4	25	29.8
Have not	68	75.6	57	67.9
do not know	0	0.0	2	2.4
Total	90	100.0	84	100.0
Chi square = 0.79	df = 2		p = ns	

It was expected the attitudes of the residents of the two sample groups on the plan of stay or to move out could affect their extent and intensity of participation in the community activities as well as residents' concern and feeling to the building. The result of above table showed no significant difference in both groups.

From the above eight socio-demographic factors, it was found that six of them had no statistical significant difference between the experimental group and the control groups. As we had controlled the factor on the length of residence in the building. We might be satisfied to say that the two sample groups had similar socio-demographic characteristics that could allow us to explore into the programme effects of community development services.

CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

The aim of this chapter is to examine the differences between the two sample groups on the various outcome criteria that were used to measure the effects of community development services. The frequency and Chi-square test were used to compare the differences of the two sample groups in order to establish the statistical significance between the two sample groups. The significant level is set at 0.05 level.

Since the socio-demographic factor of the "years of residence of the respondents in the building" was statistically controlled. Some cases were taken out for data analysis, only 88 and 72 cases in the experimental and control groups were finally used for analysis.

The findings and results of this study are presented under the following outcome variables of community development.

RESIDENTS' PARTICIPATION

Three major aspects of residents' participation were used in this study which included:

- A. Participation in Building Management
- B. Participation in Community Activities
- C. Participation in Election Activities
- A. Participation in Building Management

There were at least three areas of participation in the building management. They were:

1. Owners Incorporation
2. Deed of Mutual Covenant
3. Building Affairs

A1. Owners Incorporation

There were three items to measure the degree and extent of residents' participation under this variable. They were "knowing the existence of the O.I. in the building", "knowing the years of existence of the O.I. in the building" and "recognizing how many O.I. members of the building". The results are shown as follow:

Table 1 "knowing the existence of the O.I."

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
yes	83	94.3	66	91.7
probably have	0	0.0	1	1.4
probably have not	5	5.7	3	4.2
no	0	0.0	2	2.8
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=3.88	df=3		p=ns	

One point should be noted in this term: the formation of the O.I. in the control group was far earlier than that of the experimental group. Though the statistical test was not significant, there is still a slightly frequency difference between 94.3% of residents in the experimental group and the 91.7% of residents in the control group in knowing the existence of the O.I. in the building. It is thus encouraging to conclude that community development services can speed up the time difference in community information, especially in management problems of

private housing.

Table 2 "knowing the years of existence of the O.I."

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
know	66	75.0	25	34.7
do not know	22	25.0	47	65.3
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=26.2	df=1		p<0.01	

There is marked significant difference in this item in "knowing the years of existence of the O.I. in the building"-- 75% of the residents in the experimental group as against 34.7% of the residents in the control group. This proves that professional intervention had made the formation of the O.I. very meaningful and eventful to the residents, and this had created a long-lasting effect on the residents.

Table 3 "recognizing how many O.I. members"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
no answer	5	5.7	11	15.3
none	57	64.8	41	56.9
1-4 persons	20	22.7	10	13.9
5-8 persons	1	1.1	3	4.2
9 and above	5	5.7	7	9.7
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=8.00	df=4		p=ns	

29.5% of residents in the experimental group could recognize more numbers of the O.I. members. There was slightly higher than 27.8% of residents in the control group in this item. In the experimental group, 22.7% of the residents knew 1 to 4 members of the O.I. whereas only 13.9% of residents in the control group claimed knowing the same number of members. However,

11	15.3
41	56.9
10	13.9
3	4.2
7	9.7

13.9% of the control group could recognize 5 or more O.I. members against only 6.8% of the experimental group. This showed that the short period of community development could only promote a small number of leaders for residents to identify, whereas the natural development of the O.I. in the control group had created a larger number of leaders for identification.

In the effect of residents' participation in the Owners Incorporation, there was only one item on the "knowing the years of existence of the O.I. among these three items showed statistical significance. However, in considering the overall effects of community development services in this aspect, we can say that the community development services had generally promoted residents' participation on a limited scale and to a limited extent.

A2. Deed of Mutual Covenant

Five items under the variable of D.M.C., the "knowing the existence of the D.M.C.", the "joining activities concerning the D.M.C.", the "knowing correctly the proper procedure for amendment of the D.M.C.", the "joining action to amend the D.M.C." and the "knowing correctly who have final decision making power on the increase of management fee" were analysed. The results are shown in the following tables:

Table 4 "knowing the existence of the DMC"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
have	50	56.8	26	36.1
have not	38	33.2	46	63.9
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=6.81	df=1		p<0.01	

56.8% of the residents in the experimental group knew the existence of the DMC in comparison with only 36.1% of the residents in the control group. The difference between the two sample groups was nearly 20.7%. The Chi-square test also showed the significant difference between the two samples. It was because Caritas-H.K. put much attention on D.M.C. and invited speakers to explain what D.M.C. was to the residents in the experimental group. It provided opportunities for residents to understand and know more about the D.M.C..

Table 5 "joining activities concerning the DMC"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
have	16	18.2	4	5.6
have not	72	81.8	68	94.4
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=5.77	df=1		p<0.05	

In this item of "joining activities concerning the DMC", there were 18.2% of the residents in the experimental group had joined the action to fight for their own rights whereas only 5.6% of residents in the control group did join activities concerning the DMC. There was also a statistical significant difference between the two groups on this item. It was because some

activities on the D.M.C. were organised to the experimental group by the Caritas-H.K., and provided chances for them to join.

Other than these two items concerning the understanding and participation in the area of D.M.C.. The other three items showed no statistical significant differences. Comparatively speaking, these three items were more difficult for residents to understand and participate in terms of the complexity of the D.M.C.. So we may conclude that the intervention of community development services had partial effect on the residents' participation in the area of D.M.C. in the building management, particularly on the level of learning about D.M.C..

Since the Caritas-H.K. put very much attention and efforts on the areas of organizing residents to form the O.I. and understanding on the D.M.C., there was expectation to have programme effects on these areas. We may easily understand that once the designated activities of community development services were provided to the experimental group, the effects on the community development outcomes were expected to happen.

A3. Building Affairs

In the area of building affairs, a series of physical problems concerning about the building management were listed for the respondents to comment if there were something wrong with these problems in their own building. They were asked if they had taken any individual or/and collective actions to solve the problems. No statistical significances were found on the chi-square tests in the results.

Table 6 "building management problems needed improvement"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
no answers	1	1.1	1	1.4
one item	23	26.1	14	19.4
two items	28	31.8	14	19.4
three items	22	25.0	21	29.2
four items	5	5.7	12	16.7
five items	8	9.1	8	11.1
six items	1	1.1	2	2.8
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=8.58	df=6		p=ns	

The table shows 82.9% of residents in the experimental group which was slightly higher than 68.0% of residents in the control group identified 1-3 items on the building management problems needed improvement whereas 30.6% of the residents in the control group identified 4-6 items on the building management problems. Community development services, which are very often issue-focused, had a generally action-oriented direction that aim to channel community strength to solve prioritised problems. The findings in this item particularly illustrated the intervention approach and effects of community development services.

Table 7 "taking individual action to improve the problems"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
no action	24	27.3	16	22.2
one item	27	30.7	18	25.0
two items	20	22.7	17	23.6
three items	9	10.2	13	18.1
four items	1	1.1	6	8.3
five items	3	3.4	1	1.4
six items	3	3.4	1	1.4
seven items	1	1.1	0	0.0
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=9.43	df=7		p=ns	

27.3% of residents in the experimental group reported that they took no action at all in the improvement of building management problems comparing with 22.2% of residents in the control group. It may be the effect that the residents in the experimental group felt less discontent on the building management problems. On the other hand, slightly more residents in the experimental group were active in solving housing problems as shown in their taking part in one item (30.7%), five items(3.4%), and six to seven items(4.5%). Those who took part in more than four items might have been the indigenous leaders developed through the community development services.

Table 8 "taking collective action to improve the problems"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
no action	47	53.4	35	48.6
one item	11	12.5	10	13.9
two items	18	20.5	8	11.1
three items	9	10.2	11	15.3
four items	1	1.1	6	8.3
five items	2	2.3	2	2.8
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=7.90	df=5		p=ns	

However, concerning about the taking up of collective action to improve the building management problems, the results found no differences at all. Even when the community development services had tried to focus and prioritise management problems for the residents to solve them, they had to overcome the apathy and the pure "house-keeper" role of the residents. The mobilization of the residents to adopt a "tenant-role" in taking action to improve management problems had proved to be very difficult.

From the results found above, we could conclude that the intervention of CDSs could generate the effects of community development in the understanding level and the simple action level such as joining activities rather than the attitudinal and feeling level in terms of the residents' participation in building management. The participation level was simply a knowledge base one for knowing the basic information of the O.I and DMC as well as behaviorally joining some activities relating to the DMC only. Other than that, the results showed no significant difference from the impact of CDSs in the experimental group. It might be that the effects of CDSs could only affect the knowledge and behavioral level and could not influence beyond the attitudinal level. Attitudinal changes need more penetrating and indepth efforts, as well as more impending issues to be realised.

B. Participation in Community Activities

Two major aspects of residents' participation in community activities were used in this study. They were participation in community association and in general community activities.

B1. Participation in community association

In this area, several items of participation in community association were used for assessment. They were "membership in any association", "years joined the association", "membership status in the association" and the "attendance, work done and time spent in the association in the past one year."

No significant differences were found among the items in regard to the residents' participation in association. Since there were only 12 and 11 residents in the experimental and control groups showing their membership status in any association. It was not significant for this study to further analyze the data due to this small number of residents.

B2. Participation in general community activities

The pattern of residents' participation in different categories of community activities were measured in the study. They included "joining activities, reading local community newspaper, and joining local community activities". The results are shown as follows:

Table 9 "joining activities"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
yes	22	25.0	18	25.0
no	66	75.0	54	75.0
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=0	df=1		p=ns	

There was an interesting situation that both the percentage for the respondents in the two samples was the same. Both groups reported 25.0% did join any activities. Since the two sample groups located side by side in the same community. The chance for joining the community activities is equal to them. Even we could not find out more residents in the experimental group joined the community activities. The following table showed the different level of intensity of joining activities among the residents.

Table 10 "frequency in joining any activities"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
1-2	10	45.5	10	55.6
3 and above	12	54.5	8	44.4
Total	22	100.0	18	100.0
Chi-square=0.40	df=1		p=ns	

In terms of the frequency in joining activities, the study found the 54.5% of residents in the experimental group reported joining 3 and above items. That was higher than 44.4% of residents in the control group. It indicated that the effect of community development services in the private housing could intensify the frequency of joining activities. That kind of effect was also found in the following tables.

Table 11 "reading local community newspaper"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
have	26	29.5	12	16.7
have not	62	70.5	60	83.3
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=3.63	df=1		p=ns	

Table 12 "frequency in reading local community newspaper"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
1-2	15	57.7	7	58.3
3 and above	11	42.3	5	41.7
Total	26	100.0	12	100.0
Chi-square=0.00	df=1		p=ns	

From the above two tables, 29.5% of residents in the experimental group have read the local newspapers against 16.7% of residents in the control group. Amongst the residents who have read the local newspaper, 42.3% of the residents in the experimental group read more frequently than 41.7% of residents in the control group.

There were no statistical significant differences between the two sample groups in regard to joining community activities and reading local newspaper. Yet looking at the frequency in joining community activities and reading local newspaper, 54.5% and 42.3% of the residents in the experimental group were higher than 44.4% and 41.7% of residents in the control group accordingly. That showed once the residents in the experimental group were involved in the community activities and reading local newspaper, they participated in a higher level of intensity. We may conclude that the implementation of community development services would intensify the residents participation in this area.

C) Participation in Election Activities

The various aspects of residents' participation in Election Activities were measured with the items including "registered as voter", "voting behavior", "joining election activities", "seeking help from members of DB/UC/LC", "knowing the name of DB/UC/LC members" and "joining activities relating to DB/UC/LC".

There were no significant differences among all the above items in election activities. Some items showed the per-

centages in the experimental group were higher than those in the control group were presented as follows.

Table 13 "registered as voter"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
yes	50	56.8	39	54.2
no	38	43.2	33	45.8
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=0.11	df=1		p=ns	

Table 14 "will register"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
yes	12	31.6	8	24.2
no	26	68.4	25	75.8
Total	38	100.0	33	100.0
Chi-square=0.47	df=1		p=ns	

56.8% of residents in the experimental group have registered as voters which was slightly higher than 54.2% of residents in the control group. Among those residents who have not yet registered as voters in the experimental group showed 31.6% of residents in the experimental group would register in future against 24.2% of residents in the control group.

Concerning the item of seeking help from the members of DB/UC/LC, the results showed in the following table:

Table 15 "seeking help from members of DB/UC/LC"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
yes	44	50.0	31	43.1
no	44	50.0	41	56.9
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=0.77	df=1		p=ns	

50.0% residents in the experimental group showed in seeking help from members of DB/UC/LC to solve building problem or inviting them to attend residents meeting against 43.1% of residents in the control group. In fact, the Caritas-H.K. did invite D.B. member to offer talk and help in organizing O.I. for the experimental group. It was also a resource pool for the building under the spirit of community development services.

Concerning about the percentage on knowing the names of the councillor in the district, 33.3% of residents in the experimental group knew the name of their legislative councillor against 19.4% of residents in the control group. It may be the popularity of the Legislative member and also the function of the legislative council that could give more confidence to residents in problem solving ability.

Concerning the residents' participation in the election activities, none of the items under this aspect showed significant difference. It might be that the CDSs provided by the Caritas-HK had gave less attention in this election activity. Again, the election activity is a colony wide issue. The services provided to the experimental group by the Caritas-HK has focused on the building issue instead of the colony wide attention.

Among all the areas concerning the residents' participation, this study indicated that the implementation of community development services in the private housing blocks could affect the changes on the residents' participation in the building

management affairs rather than in general community participation and election activity.

NEIGHBORLINESS

Another major aspect to measure the outcomes of the CDSs in the private housing block was the factor of neighborliness. There were several areas to indicate the extent and the intensity of neighborliness. They were "numbers of neighbors recognized and say hello", numbers of neighbors recognized and know their surnames", "numbers of neighbors will chat with", numbers of neighbors will offer help", "frequencies of interactional behaviors with neighbors" and "overall attitudes towards neighborliness".

The residents in the two sample groups reported no statistical differences in regard to the "numbers of neighbor recognized and said hello", "knew their surnames", "numbers of neighbor recognized and chatted with", and "offer help". Some differences in percentage were identified among the above items and shown as following tables:

Table 16 "numbers of neighbor recognized and chatted with"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
none	28	31.8	35	48.6
1 - 6	37	42.0	27	37.5
7 - 12	16	18.2	6	8.3
13- 18	4	4.5	3	4.2
19 or above	3	3.4	1	1.4
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=6.49	df=4		p=ns	

Concerning the item on the "chatted with the neighbors", 68.2% of the residents in the experimental group that was

higher than 51.4% of residents in the control group. We may conclude the implementation of community development could create more chances for residents to interact with each other. The superficial contacts would be expected to become more indepth relationship among neighbors through the implementation of community development services. The following table shows the situation on the more intensive neighborliness.

Table 17 "numbers of neighbor offered help"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
none	34	38.6	23	31.9
1 - 6	47	53.4	44	61.1
7 - 12	4	4.5	3	4.2
13- 18	3	3.4	1	1.4
19 or above	0	0.0	1	1.4
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=2.79	df=4		p=ns	

For the item offered help to neighbors, 68.1% of residents in the control group did show a higher percentage than 61.3% of residents in the experimental group. The findings revealed that intensive and more in-depth neighborhood relationship need longer time to build up and the short period of community intervention could produce very limited or even no effects in this aspect.

For the item on the neighbor interactional activities, the study assigned one score to each respondents' interactional behavior and summed them up to compare the differences between the two sample groups. The result was showed as follow:

Table 18 "interactional activities (scores)"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
6	10	11.4	0	0.0
7	10	11.4	7	9.7
8	16	18.2	16	22.2
9	11	12.5	16	22.2
10	15	17.0	3	4.2
11	10	11.4	9	12.5
12	8	9.1	8	11.1
13	5	5.7	5	6.9
14	1	1.1	0	0.0
15	0	0.0	4	5.6
16	2	2.3	3	4.2
18	0	0.0	1	1.4
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=24.35	df=11		p<0.05	

The interactional activities among neighbors was found significantly different in the two sample groups at 0.05 level of confidence. It indicated the provision of community development services could offer opportunities for the residents to interact and know each other.

Concerning about the overall attitudes on the overall neighborliness, the results showed as following table:

Table 19 "overall attitudes towards overall neighborliness"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
very satisfactory	2	2.3	3	4.2
satisfactory	36	40.9	28	38.9
fair	45	51.1	40	55.6
unsatisfactory	5	5.7	1	1.4
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=2.59	df=3		p=ns	

Referring to the "attitudes towards overall neighborliness", there was no significant difference between the two sample groups at 0.05 level of confidence. Even in the experimen-

tal group, 5.7% of residents reported "unsatisfactory" in this item. There may be the provision of community development services could arouse the residents' expectation on the better neighborliness. Therefore, they showed more "unsatisfactory" on this item.

We may conclude the implementation of community development services in the private housing blocks could partially improve the neighborhood relationship through the interactional activities among neighbors.

The objectives of the CDSs provided by the Caritas-HK stressed very much on the promotion of the neighborliness. The goals of the community development also highlighted the importance of the promotion of neighborliness. The results and findings in this study showed that there was considerable effect of the implementation of community development services on the residents' interactional behaviors in the neighborliness. However, more intensive and in-depth level of neighborliness can only be built upon a sense of symbolic belonging to the community that will be analyzed in the following paragraphs.

SENSE OF BELONGING

From the results in the neighborliness, it could anticipate the findings on the sense of belonging. A series of items were used to study the extent and intensity of "sense of belonging" between the two sample groups. Under the building management, two items were used to measure the residents' sense

of belonging to the building by asking them the "residents' cooperativeness to improve building's problems" and the "residents' satisfaction towards the building". In addition to these two items, some items were also used to assess the residents' sense of belonging, they were "perception of the building in comparison with others", "relatedness of the building affairs", "reaction to social award to the building", "concern about the building affairs", "feelings towards living in the building", "feelings towards leaving the building", "sense of capability in solving building management problems by the residents collectively" and "willing to serve for the building". The results of the finding are shown as follow:

Table 20 "residents' cooperation to improve buildings' problem"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
cooperative	13	14.8	13	18.1
fair	23	26.1	27	37.5
not cooperative	43	48.9	27	37.5
very uncooperative	9	10.2	5	6.9

Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=3.56	df = 3		p = ns	

48.9% and 10.2% of residents in the experimental group reported "not cooperative" and "very uncooperative" on this item whereas there were only 37.5% and 6.9% of residents in the control group. It revealed there was higher expectation of residents in the experimental group on the improvement of building problems.

Table 21 "residents' satisfaction towards the building"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
satisfactory	28	31.8	20	27.8
fair	37	42.0	37	51.4
not satisfactory	21	23.9	13	18.1
very unsatisfactory	2	2.3	2	2.8
<hr/>				
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=1.63	df = 3		p = ns	

Totally, there were 26.2% residents in the experimental group showed negative feeling towards their own building against 20.9% of residents in the control group.

Concerning to the "residents' cooperativeness to improve building's problems" and the "residents' satisfaction towards the living building", even there were no significant differences, the percentage of the residents in the experimental group reported "not cooperative" and "not satisfactory" was higher than those residents in the control group in these two items.

We may say that with the implementation of community development services, residents felt more demanding on the physical setting. The implementation of community development services could enhance residents' concern to the building. Indirectly speaking, residents' attitudes in the experimental group were eager for improvement on these items.

Some sentimental elements and feeling towards the building for the assessment of the sense of belonging were directly asked and the results were presented as follow:

Table 22 "perception of the building"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
extremely good	0	0.0	2	2.8
good	16	18.2	10	13.9
fair	37	42.0	41	56.9
bad	30	34.1	12	16.7
extremely bad	5	5.7	7	9.7
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=10.14	df=4		p=ns	

In the experimental group, there were 18.2% of residents reported "good" and also 34.1% of them responded "bad" in this item. Both percentages in these two categories were higher than those in the control group. It was easy for us to understand that most residents in the experimental group would like to express their feelings on the building. It revealed that residents in the experimental group have more concern on the building.

Concerning the reaction to social award to the building, the results from the following table indicated the residents in the experimental group were more emotionally involved.

Table 23 "reaction to social award to the building"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
extremely excited	43	48.9	32	44.4
excited	24	27.3	22	30.6
depends	12	13.6	5	6.9
not excited	5	5.7	7	9.7
extremely not excited	4	4.5	6	8.3
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=3.75	df=4		p=ns	

Only 10.2% of residents in the experimental group revealed "not excited" and "extremely not excited" to the social award to the building whereas there was 18.0% of residents reported these situation in the control group. Again, 48.9% of residents in the experimental group reported extremely excited against the 44.4% of residents in the control group. From these results on the two extremes, we might conclude that the residents in the experimental group were more emotionally involved in this area. It also reflected the feeling and concern of the residents in the experimental group were more involved.

Other than the above items, two items were directly asked to measure the sense of belonging among the residents. The results are shown as follow:

Table 24 "concern about the building affairs"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
extremely concern	14	15.9	10	13.9
concern	51	58.0	27	37.5
general	17	19.3	25	34.7
not concern	6	6.8	7	9.7
extremely not concern	0	0.0	3	4.2
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=11.16	df=4		p<0.05	

Among all the items of sense of belonging, only this item proved statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance. 73.9% of residents in the experimental group showed more concern than 51.4% of residents in the control group. We may conclude the residents in the experimental group have a relatively strong sense of concern on the building.

Table 25 "willingness to serve for the building"

	Experimental group		Control group	
	f	%	f	%
definitely will	21	23.9	11	15.3
will	49	55.7	36	50.0
depends	2	2.3	4	5.6
will not	10	11.4	17	23.6
definitely will not	6	6.8	4	5.6
Total	88	100.0	72	100.0
Chi-square=6.45	df=4		p=ns	

Although the statistical test was not significant in this item. 79.6% of residents in the experimental group reported positively their willingness to serve for the building in comparing with those 65.3% of residents in the control group. It revealed the residents' sense of commitment to serve the building in the experimental group was greater than those residents in the control group.

From these above results, it indicated that the implementation of community development services could have some effects on the promotion of residents' sense of belonging in the private housing area.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

SHORT SUMMARY ON THE STUDY PLAN

This study was an outcome programme evaluation on the effects of community development for the residents living in the private housing blocks. The aim was to explore and establish whether the implementation of CDSs would affect some changes of residents' attitudes and behaviors in the private housing in relation to the goals of community development. Three major criteria variables were used: residents' participation, neighborliness, and sense of belonging.

The methodology used was an Ex-post facto research design. Two groups, one group of residents from the Lee Kei private housing building with the implementation of CDSs by the Caritas-HK was taken as the experimental group and the other group of residents from another Wang Kwong House without such provision was chosen as the control group.

The measurement of CDSs programme impacts was a questionnaire. Data was collected through interviewing two sample groups of residents from the same community. Respondents had similar background as well as socio-demographic characteristics. A total of 174 household heads or their spouses were selected by random from the two buildings for the interviews. Finally, these were 90 samples for the experimental group and 84 samples for the control group respectively. After introducing a statistical control on the years of residence in the building, 88 and 72

respective cases of the experimental and control groups were used for data analysis. Simple statistical techniques of frequency comparison and chi-square test were used.

Brief Summary and Discussion of Findings

1. Socio-Demographic Profiles

In order to ensure the comparability of the two sample groups, eight variables of socio-demographic characteristics of the residents were checked. They were age, sex, education level, income, years of residence in the building, years of residence in the district, plan of stay in the building and economic status.

The results of chi-square test shown that there were no significant differences between the residents of the experimental and control groups regarding to the six variables on age, sex, education level, income, plan of stay, and economic status. whereas for the remaining two variables, years of residence in the building and years of residence in the district, a statistical control was undertaken to compare the variable of the years of residence in the building. Therefore, it was safe to conclude that all the socio-demographic variables were not intervening variables accounting for any difference in the community development programme outcomes between the two sample groups.

2 Residents' Participation

Among all the items in relation to the residents' participation, it is surprised to see that there were only a few items found significantly different between the experimental group and control group. In terms of building management, commu-

nity participation and participation in election activities, there were only slight programme effectiveness of community development on building management, whereas there were no effect for the latter two items.

Many studies as mentioned in the literature review on participation found that membership in any association and membership status in the associations were significant indicators to measure the extent of residents participation. Particularly, some studies assessing programme effectiveness of community development in other types of communities also found these indicators were very significant. Unfortunately, we could not verify this effect in this study. Participation in private housing on a general information seeking level, and action-oriented and organization-attached activities are less significant. There are obstacles against collective action. The nature and characteristics of the private housing setting is not favorable to the achievement of goal of participation in community development deserves more further studies.

Anyway, from the above findings, we can draw a simple conclusion that community development programmes can only have a very narrow effect on resident's participation in private housing communities. Residents are more concerned about their own interests and problems, as is demonstrated by their concern on the DMC which affects their level of management fees. But knowing does not mean doing, and their involvement in changing their environmental situation and community affairs like election and local OIs, are not their major concern.

Community development programmes which attempt to

stimulate social awareness and involvement are faced with an icy apathy of self-interest which resists altruistic commitment in community affairs in the private housing. Community development programmes, though they have shown effectiveness in public housing and squatter areas in the promotion of residents' participation, can achieve very limited effects in the private housing.

That put us in a very realistic situation in providing community development services to private housing. The private housing community is less communal, less collective, and less action-prone. However, this does not mean that the residents are hesitant to seek information to defend their own housing units. Private housing, as a community, has serious effect on the nature of participation. It is a kind of private profit-oriented investment that requires good selling points, and as a result, the information about management problems and the deteriorating quality of housing should be kept away from the public, open, collective and confrontational actions are thus kept to the minimum to maintain the "sell-ability" of the dwelling unit. The focus of social intervention into this particular community shall adapt to the complexity of the nature of private housing, and expectation of idealised communitarianism should be treated with extreme caution.

3. Neighbourliness

In this study, there were three dimensions to measure the neighborliness in the residents' behaviors in terms of the recognition of the numbers of neighbors in the building, the

interactional behaviors among neighbor in different areas, and the attitudes towards the neighborliness. Among all the items of the neighborliness, only the item on the numbers of neighbors recognized and chatted with was statistically significant in the experimental group. The rest of all other items were not significantly different in this study.

The objectives of the CDSs stressed very much on the promotion of neighborliness, however, the results in this study could only slightly justify the programme effects on this aspect. As is pointed out in the literature review, satisfaction with the neighborhood is strongly determined by the individual's perception of the condition of the housing quality, of the friendliness of its residents, of its security from crime occurrence, and of the convenience to work and shopping. Neighborliness is the result of a lot of social conditions, and professional community development service is only one of the factors involved. If other factors are less coherent, then the effects of CDSs will be very limited.

This provides us with a clue in realistically understanding the function of community development in private housing. Community development can provide chances for residents to interact, yet it cannot help to build up neighborly relationship which is conditional upon spatial distance, housing quality and convenience of living. The idea of promotion of a sense of neighborliness may be too idealistic and grand. Instead, the provision of interaction opportunities may be the realistic goal of community intervention.

4. Sense of belonging

The sense of belonging is a kind of moral unity and wholeness emotional identity. Among the items concerning about this aspect, only one item - the concern about building affairs - of the sense of belonging was significant in the experimental group. The other items such as perception of the building in comparison with others, relatedness of the building affairs, reaction to social awards to the building, feelings towards living in the building, feeling towards leaving the building, willingness to serve the building, and sense of collective capability in solving building management problems by the residents were not significant at all.

The promotion of the sense of belonging is the soul concept of community development because it gives the residents a sense of identity and commitment. However, this is the most difficult part for professional community development intervention. The sense of belonging is the continuity of the cultural symbols of a community. It requires the community worker to empathize with the community and to understand the symbolic meanings of certain types of behavior, but at the same time to bring the community out of its cultural past to meet present challenges.

The demand on the community worker is thus exceedingly high. In the egoistic and alienating industrial urban society, the sense of belonging is a dream rather than a realistic goal.

Although our findings can prove very limited effects on the promotion of the sense of belonging, this does not mean that this dream will perish. The meaning of the sense of belong-

ing will continue to persist in the social work ideology in the future.

From the above summary, the survey results found that:

1. With the implementation of CDSs, residents' participation level in the building management affairs was slightly higher than those residents without such CDSs provision.
2. With the implementation of CDSs, the neighborliness was more intensive than those residents without such CDSs provision.
3. With the implementation of CDSs, the residents' level of sense of belonging was slightly higher than those residents without such CDSs provision.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

For ethnical and practical reasons, it was difficult to carry out experimentation in the community in assigning experimental and control groups. It was not feasible, then, to obtain baseline conditions in comparison with intervention outcome. Thus, the effectiveness of community development services lacks a base of comparison.

In order to remedy this limitation, the Ex-post facto design was used. Instead of comparing a before-and-after effect of intervention on the same group of residents, we tried to compare results on two groups of residents with similar socio-economic conditions. In this case, we cannot directly prove the change of attitudes and behavior amongst the residents due to the provision of community development services, but at least indirectly prove a probability of intervention effects between two

groups of residents.

Concerning about the measurements of the study, there was a lack of existing indicators for this study to adopt as reference to assess the programme outcomes of community development services. We have to devise indicators ourselves. The validity and reliability of indicators need to be further explored and developed.

There was also a time gap between the provision of CDSS to the experimental group by the Caritas-HK and the study carried out. The time gap might interrupt the effects of CDSS on the outcomes of community development. The time gap would weaken the intensity of effects of CDSS.

Concerning the generalization of the results, there are limitations for this study. It was because this study only identified two private housing buildings as sample for comparison and it cannot represent the diverse nature of private housing community. So, it was not expected to generalize the finding results to other types of private housing blocks.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is a surprise to see that community development services provided for private housing areas found slight significant effects on the residents' participation, neighborliness, and sense of belonging among residents living in private housing areas.

As compared with other researches (SWD, 1976; Lam, 1984) in the public housing and squatters that showed significant effects of the community development services intervention and other studies (Chan, 1976; Kwok, 1979) in the public housing and

rural village in which less and no significant effects were found. For this study, it seems that we can draw an early, perhaps immature, conclusion that community development services in those communities that are more "public" (public housing, squatters) achieve different effects than on those areas that are more "private" (rural and private housing).

Why this is so? This problem needs to be studied in a more in-depth and extensive ways. Are there some unique features in the "private" community sectors we have overlooked that may have a neutralizing effect over community work intervention? Is the problem of proprietorship (Fung, 1993) in the private housing an important feature that may influence the sense of neighborliness and belonging, and also the level and direction of participation?

If this is so, then there are serious implications for community development services to operate in private housing communities. Firstly, CDSs teams need to analyze community problems in private housing in relation to proprietorship, e.g. the sense of ownership, utilization, management, and participation rights over private and public spaces in the community; property protection as against the promotion of a sense of neighborliness; the length of stay may influence the sense of belonging etc.

Secondly, CDSs teams should have a realistic expectation on the level and direction of participation in private housing communities as against those in public housing. Residents in public housing and mutual-help housing (squatters) face common community problems that are controlled by public authorities, their "private" spheres of living are often influenced by outside

agencies and as a result they may accept community services more willingly, and community development effects may last longer and stronger. Whereas, in private housing areas, the inward protection of "private life " may neutralize the outward participation into community life. Therefore, even moderate effects found in this study, it does not necessarily mean that the CDSs are not effective. It means that more obstacles to be overcome by the community workers while providing CDSs in the private housing areas.

Thirdly, there are also implications on the methods of community intervention in private housing areas. Traditional community development usually work towards the building up of a residents' organization that needs more intensive efforts in interpersonal relations to promote long-lasting common concerns. This is defined as the process goal approach and it may be more suitable to public housing areas. But for the private housing areas, it may be more suitable for CDSs to work on the community issues in creating the common feeling, and build up relatively loose communication networks that does not require intensive interpersonal relationship but more extensive intra- and inter-community contact (Fung, 1993).

As a summary, this study contributes to the contextual analysis of the effects of CDSs in raising questions about proprietorship that we often neglected. It further proved that traditional CDSs, though effective in some types of communities, are not necessarily effective in all types of communities. But it does not prove that CDSs are not needed in the private housing areas, it only shows that we need to have an understanding on the

obstacles that CDSs have to overcome before we analyze their programme effectiveness. This is the new ground we have to explore in the future.

Last but not the least, theoretical constructs are very important in guiding us to analyze. Unfortunately in Hong Kong, this is the weakest part in community development especially for working methods in private housing settings. Professionals are too concerned with "practice" rather than "theories". For this study, generating some minor significances of the programme impacts for the residents living in the private housing areas can serve as a "start" for community workers to build up the uniqueness of theories for community development for the private housing residents.

The present study could only prove the implementation of community development services generated slight effects on the programme outcomes such as residents' participation, neighborliness and sense of belonging, many problem areas range from the physical setting, interpersonal relationship to the housing policy were identified for improvement.

The community development services could help the residents through the organizing efforts to solve and tackle the problems. It was recommended that the bottom-up approach of community development services focusing on the promotion of autonomous residents participation and neighborliness both as an end in itself and also as a problem-solving method should be advocated in the private housing areas. It is dissatisfying to see many Non-government organizations to deploy very little resource to help residents in the private housing areas. The

government also pooled little resource to the private housing areas. By pooling the collective efforts of the government and NGOs in helping the residents in the private housing areas, the implementation of community development services could generate the residents behavioral changes, especially in the area of building management affairs.

If given continuing effort and sufficient manpower and resources into the private housing areas, the residents would improve their attitudes and action levels in solving problems in the community. Through the involvement of residents in the problem solving process, the level of neighborliness and sense of belonging can be increased gradually. This process will be a long lasting one.

All in all, there is a lack of evaluation study on the community development services in the private housing. As a pilot study, this study expects to stimulate more community workers' awareness and interest to conduct further studies in different types of private housing as well as to develop some instruments for the assessment of community development outcome in the private housing.

References

- Alinsky, S. D., Rules for Radicals : A Practical Primer for Realistic Radicals. New York : Vintage Books. 1971.
- Altman, I. & Taylor, D.A., The Development of Interpersonal Relationship: Social Penetration. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973.
- Altman, I., "The Communication of Interpersonal Attitudes: An Ecological Approach." Herston, T.L., Perspectives on Interpersonal Attraction. New York: Academic Press, 1973.
- Alwin, Duane F., Converse, Philip E. and Martin, Steven S., "Living Arrangements and Social Integration", Andrews Frank M., Research on the Quality of Life. University of Michigan, 1986.
- Anderson, "Introduction: Geography and Policy" in D. Potter et al. Society and the Social Sciences. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981
- Angell, Robert C. "The Model Integration of American Cities", American Sociological Review 1956, Vol. 21, 13-18.
- Arnstein, S.R., "A Ladder of Citizen Participation", American Institute of Planners' Journal, Vol 35, July, 217, 1969.
- Baddie, E.R., The Practice of Social Research. (5th ed.) USA: Wardsworth Publishing Co., 1989.
- Baldock, P. "Why Community Action ? The Historical Origins of the Radical Trend in British Community Work". Community Development Journal vol. 12. no. 2. 1977.
- Biddle, W.W. and Biddle, L.J., The Community Development Process : The Recovery of Local Initiative. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1956.
- Blakely, Edward J., (ed.) Community Development Research: Concepts, Issues and Strategies. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1979.
- Brager, George and Specht, Harry, Community Organization. New York: Columbia University Press, 1973.
- Burghart, Steve, Organizing for Community Action. USA: Sage Publication, inc., 1982.
- Burke, E.M. "Citizen Participation: Characteristics and Strategies" in Kramer R.M. (ed) Readings in Community Organization. 3rd ed. USA: Prentice Hall, 1983.
- Campbell, Agnus, The Sense of Well-Being in America: Recent Patterns and Trends. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1981.

- Campbell, A., Converse P.E., and Rodgers, N.L., The Quality of American Life: Perceptions, Evaluations and Satisfaction. Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1976.
- Cassirer, D., An Essay on Plan: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Cary, Lee J., (ed.), Community Development As a Process. University of Missouri Press, 1970.
- Chan, T.C., Community Development in Hong Kong Housing Estate: A Programme Evaluation of The Work Of The Voluntary Organizations.
M. Sc. Thesis, Asian Institute of Technology, July, 1976.
- Chapin, Stuart F., "Social Participation and Social Intelligence", American Sociological Review 1939, Vol. 4, 157-166.
- Checkoway, B. "Building Citizen Support for Planning at the community Level", Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare Vol. 13. 1986.
- Cheng, A. Government's Role in Management of Private Housing Buildings. 1989 (mimeograph copy in CDD, HKCSS).
- Cohen, Anthony P., Belonging: Identity and Social Organization in British Rural Cultures. Manchester University Press, 1991.
- Cowley, J. et al., Community or Class Struggle. Great Britain: Stage 1. 1977.
- Cox, F.M. "Communities : Alternative conceptions of community : Implications for Community Organization Practice" in Cox et al., Strategies of Community Organization. USA : F.E. Peacock. 1987.
- Cox, W.H., Cities : The Public Dimension. Penguin Books, 1977.
- Curno, P., Political Issues and Community Work. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1978.
- Dauigelis, N.L., "Black Political Participation in the United State: Some Recent Evidence", American Sociological Review 1978, Vol.43, 756-770.
- Drakakis-Smith, D., High Society; Housing Provision in Metropolitan Hong Kong 1954-1979, Hong Kong: Centre of Asian Studies, HKU, 1979.
- Dunham, Arthur, The New Community Organization. New York: Cronwell, 1970.
- Durkheim, Emile, Essays on Sociology and Philosophy: with Appraisals of Durkheim's Life and Thought. Harper & Row: N.Y. 1964

- Ekman, Ann-Kristin, Community Carnival and Campaign: Expressions of Belonging in Swedish Region. Stockholm Studies in Social Anthropology, 1991.
- Epstein, T., Tripodi, T., and Fellin, P., "Community Development Program and Their Evaluation", Community Development Journal January, 1973, 28-36.
- Fried, M., and Gleicher, P., "Some Scores of Residential Satisfaction in An Urban Slum", Journal of the American Institute of Planners November, 1961, 305-315.
- Fung, H.L., "Combating Urban Blight", in Chan, C. ed. Limited Gains: Grassroots Mobilization and the Environment in Hong Kong. Hong Kong: Centre of Urban Planning and Environmental Management, University of Hong Kong, 1993.
- Gans, H.J., "Planning for People, not Buildings", Environment and Planning. vol.1, 1969.
- Gans, H., People and Plans: Essay on Urban Problems and Solutions New York: Basic Books, 1968.
- Gilbert, Neil and Specht, Harry, "Process Versus Task in Social Planning", Social Work 1977, Vol. 22.
- Goode, W.J. and Hatt, R.K., Method in Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc., 1952.
- Greenburg, B.G., "Evaluation of Social Programs", Review of the International Statistical Institute 1968, Vol. 36, No.3.
- Hall, Edward T., The Hidden Dimension. Anchor Books, Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1969.
- Hediger, H., Studies of the Psychology and Behavior of Captive Animals in Zoos and Circuses. London: Butterworth & Company, 1950.
- Henderson, P., Jones D & Thomas N., The Boundaries of Environment and Change in Community Work. London : George Allen & Unwin. 1980.
- Henderson, P., & Thomas, N., Skills in Neighborhood Work. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1980.
- Hillery, G.A. Jr., "Definitions of Community : Areas of Agreement", Rural Sociology 20:779-91, 1955.
- Hodge, P. & D. Brokensha., Community Development : An Interpretation. USA : Chandler Publishing Co. 1969.
- Hong Kong Council of Social Service, Community Development Resource Book. Community Development Division, 1983, 1986.

- Hong Kong Council of Social Services, "Report on CD in Private Housing", Community Development Division, 1984.
- Hong Kong Council of Social Services, "Assessment of the Need for Service in Nam Cheong West Sub-District", Community Development Division, 1986.
- Hong Kong Council of Social Services, "Report of the Data Collection Exercise on Community Development Projects in Private Housing Areas", Community Development Division, 1989.
- Hong Kong Council of Social Service, "The Information Paper On Community Development in Private Housing", Community Development Division, 1990.
- Hong Kong Government, Hong Kong 1992. Government Printer Hong Kong, 1992
- Hooyman, Nancy, R., "Strategies of Citizen Participation", Jones, J. and Pandey, R., (ed.), Social Development. USA: St. Martin's Press, 1981.
- Hyman, D. "On the Dialectics of Social Theory and Action : a Synthesis of Six Models of Community Engagement", Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare Vol. 13. 1986.
- Jones, D. & M. Mayos., Community Work : I. London : Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1974.
- Kahn, Alfred J., Theory and Practice of Social Planning. New York:Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.
- Kahn, Alfred J, and Finestone, Samuel, "The Design of Research", Polansky, Norman A., (ed.), Social Work Research: Method for the Helping Professions. USA: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Kan, A., A Study of Neighborly Interaction in Public Housing: The Case of Hong Kong. Social Research Centre, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1974.
- Kerlinger, F.N., Behavioral Research: A Conceptual Approach. USA: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973.
- King, Y. C., "Administrative Absorption of Politics in Hong Kong: Emphasis on the Grass Roots Level", Asia Survey Vol.15, no.5 (May, 1975)
- Konig, Rene, The Community. Routledge & K. Paul: London 1968.
- Kwok, K.F., Evaluation Research on Grassroots Community Development Project: A Case Study of The Tai O Project. MSW Thesis, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1979.

- Lam, H.S., Study on Community Development in Squatter Areas: An Evaluation Research on Programme Impact of NLCDPs in Diamond Hill Squatter Areas. M.S.W.. Thesis, CUHK, 1987.
- Lambert, J. "Political Values and Community Work Practice" in Paul Curno (ed), Political Issues and Community Work. London : Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1978.
- Lee, K.Y., Structure and Dynamics at a Local Neighborhood: Towards a Community Development Model in a Private Housing Estate. Hong Kong Polytechnic and N.A.A.C., 1990
- Lees, R. & M. Mayo., Community Action for Change. London : Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1984.
- Leung, C.B., "Community Work - the Role of Social Work" in Cheng Y. S. (eds), Hong Kong in the Mid-eighties. Hong Kong: University Publisher & Printer. 1985.
- Lippitt, R., Watson, J. and Westly, B., The Dynamics of Planned Change. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1958.
- Lyon, H., The Community in Urban Society. USA : Lexington Books. 1989.
- Madge, Charles, "A Sociologist Looks at Social Education", Community Development Bulletin 1960, Vol. XII.
- Martindale, Don., The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1961.
- Mayo, M., "Community Development : A Radical Alternative ?" in Roy Bailey & K. Brake (ed)., Radical Social Work. New York : Pantheon Books. 1975.
- Milson, Fred, An Introduction to Community Work. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974.
- Miners, N.J., The Government and Politics of Hong Kong. Hong Kong : Oxford University Press. 1976.
- Moos, R., & Insel, P., (ed.), Issues in Social Ecology: Human Milieus. Palo Alto, Calif.: National Press Books, 1974.
- Morris, R.N. & J. Mogey., "Common Bongs 1" in Eric Butterworth et al. The New Sociology of Modern Britain. Great Britain: Fontana Paperbacks. 1984.
- Morris, R.N. & Mogey, John, The Sociology of Housing. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1965.
- Nisbet, R.A., The Sociological Tradition. London : Heinemann Books. 1966.

- Nutt, Bev et al., Obsolescence in Housing, London: Saxon House, 1976.
- Oslen, Marvin E., "Social and Political Participation of the Black", American Sociological Review 1970, Vol. 35, 628-696.
- Pahl, R.E. "Whose City ?" New Society, January, 1969.
- Parker, Robert N., "Measuring Social Participation", American Sociology Review 1983, Vol. 48, 864-873.
- Perlman, Robert and Guria, Arnold, Community Organization and Social Planning. Canada: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1972.
- Proshansky, Harold M. et al. (ed), Environmental Psychology: People and Their Physical Setting. (2nd ed.) Halt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.
- Rein, M., "Social Planning : the Search for Legitimacy", Journal of the American Institute of Planners Vol. 35, 1969.
- Riches, G.C.P., Community Development in Hong Kong: Sau Mau Ping, A Case Study. Hong Kong: Centre of Asian Studies, University of Hong Kong, 1975.
- Ross, Murray R., Community Organization Theory, Principles and Practice. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1955.
- Ross, Murray R., Case Histories in Community Organization. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1958.
- Rothman, Jack, "An Analysis of Goals and Roles in Community Organization Practice" Social Work April, 1964.
- Rothman, Jack, Planning and Organizing for Social Change: Action Principles from Social Science Research, New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.
- Rothman, Jack, "Three Models of Community Organization Practice" Cox, Fred M., Erlich, John L., Rothman, Jack and Tropman, John, (ed.), Strategies of Community Organization: A Book of Reading. USA F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1979.
- Sanders, Irwin T., "The Concept of Community Development", Cary, Lee J., (ed.), Community Development as A Process. University of Missouri Press, 1970.
- Sing Tao Daily 1991, Papercutting, 11-3-1991.
- Social Welfare Department, Report of Tse Wan Shan Urban Community Development Project. Hong Kong: Government Printer 1979.

- Soysal, M., Public Administration: II, The Influence of The Public on The Operation of Public Administration, Excluding Electoral Right. General Report to The XIIIth International Congress of Administrative Science, Paris, 1965.
- Stassen, Jacque, "A Few Reflections on Participation" Sharma, Sudesh K., (ed.), Dynamic of Development - An International Perspective. Volume II, Dehli: Concept Publishing Company, 1977.
- Statistical Policy Division, Social Indicators 1973. Office of Management and Budget, Dept. of commerce, U.S., 1973.
- Taylor, Samuel H. and Roberts, Robert W., (ed.), Theory and Practice of Community Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.
- Tonnies, F., Community and Society. N.Y.:Harper, 1957
- Tripodi, T., "The Logic of Research Design", Richard, M. and Grinnell, J., Social Work Research and Evaluation. USA: F.E. Peacock Publisher, 1982.
- United Nations, Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, Report on The World Social Situation. New York: United Nations, 1982.
- United Nations, Twentieth Report of the Administrative Committee on contribution to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, Official Records of the 24th Session, Annex IV, New York: United Nations, 1956.
- Voth, Donald E., "An Evaluation of Community Development Programs in Illinois" Social Force 1975, Vol. 53, 635-645.
- Voth, Donald E., and Martin, Makolin J., "Evaluation Research on Community Development in Nonmetropolitan Communities", Social Service Review 1974, Vol. 48, 438-441.
- Walters, S. "A Critical Discussion of Democratic Participation within Community Organizations", Community Development Journal vol. 22, no.1. 1987.
- Wandersman, A., & Rich, R.C., "Participation in Block Organization", Social Policy, Summer, 1983.
- Warren, Roland L., The Community in America. USA: Rand McNally, 1978.
- Werner, H., Comparative Psychology of Mental Development. New York: International Universities Press, 1962.
- Wilner, Daniel M. et al., The Housing Environment and Family Life. The John Hopkins Press, 1962.

Wong, Y.L., Personal Network and Local Community Attachment:
Illustrations from two Public Housing Estates in Shatin. Master
Thesis, C.U.H.K., 1987.

Yuen, Cathy, Why Citizen Participate: A Case Study of Tuen Mun
Tai Hong Estate. MSW Thesis, The Chinese University of Hong
King, 1984.

香港屋宇事務處編。深水埗區議會，深水埗私人多層大廈居住環境
大廈管理及其居民組織 研究報告。深水埗區議會，1987。

(Appx)

CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG
SOCIAL WORK DEPARTMENT

TITLE

"PRIVATE HOUSING OWNERS' VIEW ON BUILDING MANAGEMENT,
COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION, AND NEIGHBORLINESS"

NAME OF BUILDING: LEE KEI BUILDING/WAN KWONG HOUSE

FLAT NO. : BLOCK _____, RM/FLAT

1ST ATTEMPT 2ND ATTEMPT 3RD ATTEMPT

DATE OF INTERVIEW _____

TIME OF INTERVIEW _____

NAME OF INTERVIEWER _____

RESULT: SUCCESSFUL
UNSUCCESSFUL

REMARK FOR UNSUCCESSFUL CASES:

- 1: Nobody
- 2: Rejected
- 3: Communication Problem (eg. language)
- 4: Interviewee not at home
- 5: Commercial use
- 6: Rent
- 7: Others: _____

Interviewer's Self-introduction:

Good morning/afternoon/evening, Sir/Madam, I'm the interviewer of Chinese University of Hong Kong. My name is _____, we are now conducting a research to study the "Private housings owners' view on building's management, community and social participation and neighborliness."

This is my Identity Card. (Please show your Identity Card).

Have you received the letter from Chinese University of Hong Kong, like this (show the sample), concerning about this research? You are chosen to be the interviewee? I would like to have few minutes with you to ask your view on the research issue. All the information provided will be treated confidentially and used for academic purpose only. Besides, you are not required to report your name at all.

FIND OUT THE RIGHT INTERVIEWEE:

- (1) Would you mind to tell me who the flat owner is?
Is he/she here?

Yes--- I would like to interview with him/her.
(Interview now)

No----- Is his/her spouse here?

Yes- I would like to interview with his/her spouse
(Interview now)

No- When the flat owner will come back?

(It is because he/she is our target interviewee, would you mind to inform him/her about my visit? I'll come back next time).

Rental flat--- Sorry, because our target interviewer is the flat owner, Thank you.
(Replacement)

- (2) What is your surname, Sir/Madam? _____
(You can call him/her Mr. _____/Mrs. _____ in the coming questions.)

(A) BASIC INFORMATION

A1) Sex (1) Male (2) Female

A2) How long have you live in this building?
_____ year(s)

A3) How long have you lived in Ngau Tau Kok/Kwun Tong?
_____ year(s)

A3) How old are you in your last birthday?
_____ years old.

A4) What is your education level?

- (1) No formal education
- (2) Primary
- (3) Junior Secondary (F.1 - F.3)
- (4) Senior Secondary (F.4 - F.7)
- (5) Post Secondary or University
- (6) Post graduate
- (7) Unknown

A6) Are you working?

- (1) Yes - What's your occupation? _____
Full time or part time?
 (1) Full Time
 (2) Part time
(2) No (skip to Part B)
(9) Unknown

A7) How much do you earn per month?

- | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| (1) None | (5) \$6,001 - \$9,000 |
| (2) Below \$1,500 | (6) \$9,001 - \$12,000 |
| (3) \$1,501 - \$3,000 | (7) \$12,001 - \$15,000 |
| (4) \$3,001 - \$6,000 | (8) \$15,001 or above |
| | (9) Unknown |

B) BUILDING MANAGEMENT

B1) Owners Incorporation (O.I.)

B1.1) Is there O.I. in this building?

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| (1) Yes | (3) Probably have |
| (2) No. (skip to B2) | (4) Probably have not |
| (9) Unknown (skip to B2) | |

B1.2) Do you know how long since the O.I. has established in this building?

- (1) _____ years
(9) Unknown

B1.3) How many O.I. members you recognized?

- | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| (1) None | (4) 5-6 persons | (7) 11 or above |
| (2) 1-2 persons | (5) 7-8 persons | (9) Unknown |
| (3) 3-4 persons | (6) 9-10 persons | |

B2) Deed of Mutual Covenant (DMC)

B2.1) Do you know there is any DMC in this building?

- (1) Yes
(2) No
(3) Do not know what DMC is
(9) Unknown

B2.2) Have you participated any Forum/Seminar/Talks about the DMC?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No
- (9) Unknown

B2.3) Do you know how many percentage of the owners' right can amend the DMC?

- (1) Yes, _____ %
- (9) Do not know/clear

B2.4) Have you joined any action for amendment of DMC?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No
- (3) Forgotten
- (4) No such action organized so far

B2.5) Which parties you think should have final decision making power on the increase of management fee in this building?

- (1) Small flat owners
- (2) Developer
- (3) Management company
- (4) O.I.
- (5) Government Departments
- (6) Others _____
- (9) Unknown (skip to Part C)

B2.6) Is it reasonable you think for the above party to have the final decision making power on the increase of management fee?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No opinion
- (9) Unknown

(3) No - Will you join any action to improve this unfairness?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No
- (9) Unknown

(C) QUALITY OF THE BUILDING/COMMUNITY ACTION

C1) Is there any management problems you think that should be improved? (Can choose more than one)

1. Cleaning problem (e.g. rubbish, rats, hygiene or pets etc.)
2. Law and order
3. Building facilities (e.g. water supply, electricity supply, corridor and stairs lighting facilities etc)
4. Lift management (e.g. out of order)
5. Watchman
6. Financial management
7. Others: _____
9. Unknown: (please ask every items of the following C2 and C3 questions)

C2) You just mention the items in (C1)

(a)Have you personally taken any action to improve/made complaints?	(b)Has the whole building taken any action to improve the situation/made complaints?
--	--

(1)Yes(2)No(3)Unknown (1)Yes(2)No(3)Unknown

- 1)Cleaning Problem
- 2)Law and Order
- 3)Building Facility
- 4)Lift Management
- 5)Watchman
- 6)Financial management
- 7)Others: _____

If show "Yes" in (C2) item (a) or (b), please continue to ask (C3). If "No" skip to (C4).

(3) How do you think about the satisfaction of the building after the above improvement action(s)?

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (9)*

- 1) Cleansing Problem
- 2) Law and Order
- 3) Buildings' Facilities
- 4) Lift Management
- 5) Watchman
- 6) Financial management
- 7) Others: _____

*Remark: (1) Very Satisfactory, (2) Satisfactory (3) Fair (4) Unsatisfactory (5) Very unsatisfactory, and (9) Unknown

(C4) How do you think about the level of cooperation among the residents in the whole building to improve the building problems?

- (1) Very cooperative
- (2) Cooperative
- (3) Fair
- (4) Not Cooperative
- (5) Very Uncooperative

(C5) Generally speaking, do you feel satisfactorily about the quality of this building you lived?

- (1) Very Satisfactory
- (2) Satisfactory
- (3) Fair
- (4) Unsatisfactory
- (5) Very Unsatisfactory

(D) SENSE OF BELONGING

D1) How do you think about this building in comparison with the near-by buildings?

- (1) Very good
- (2) Good
- (3) Fair
- (4) Bad
- (5) Very bad

D2) Do you think any things happened in this building are related to you?

- (1) Strongly related
- (2) Related
- (3) It depends
- (4) Not related
- (5) Strongly not related

D3) If this building had won the champion in any competition, will you be excited?

- (1) Definitely
- (2) Probably
- (3) It depends
- (4) Probably not
- (5) Definitely not

D4) How do you think your level of concern to the buildings' affairs?

- (1) Very concern
- (2) Concern
- (3) Fair
- (4) Not Concern
- (5) Very unconcern

D5) Are you happy to live in this building?

- (1) Very Happy
- (2) Happy
- (3) Fair
- (4) Unhappy
- (5) Very unhappy

D6) Do you plan to move out?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No
- (9) Unknown

D7) Will you miss this building if you have moved out?

- (1) Definitely
- (2) Probably
- (3) May be
- (4) Probably not
- (5) Definitely not

D8) Do you think it is able to solve the building problems if the residents could act collectively and cohesively?

- (1) Definitely
- (2) Probably
- (3) May be
- (4) Probably not
- (5) Definitely not

D9) Do you have time after your work/housework?

- (1) Much
- (2) Some
- (3) A little
- (4) No

D10) If you have time and ability, will you do something for the building?

- (1) Definitely
- (2) Probably
- (3) no opinion
- (4) Probably not
- (5) Definitely not

(E) NEIGHBORLINESS

E1) How many neighbors you recognized and will say "Hello" to them in this building?

- (1) None
- (2) 1-5 persons
- (3) 6-10 persons
- (4) 11-15 persons
- (5) 16-20 persons
- (6) 21-25 persons
- (7) 26-30 persons
- (8) 31 persons or above
- (9) Unknown

E2) How many households you know their surname(s) in this building?

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| (1) None | (6) 13-15 households |
| (2) 1-3 households | (7) 16-18 households |
| (3) 4-6 households | (8) 19 households or above |
| (4) 7-9 households | (9) Unknown |
| (5) 10-12 households | |

E3) How many neighbors that you will chat with them in this building?

- | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| (1) None | (7) 16-18 persons |
| (2) 1-3 persons | (8) 19 persons above |
| (3) 4-6 persons | (9) Unknown |
| (4) 7-9 persons | |
| (5) 10-12 persons | |
| (6) 13-15 persons | |

E4) If you need some help at home, how many neighbors you can find in this building?

- | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| (1) None | (5) 10-12 persons |
| (2) 1-3 persons | (6) 13-15 persons |
| (3) 4-6 persons | (7) 16-18 persons |
| (4) 7-9 persons | (8) 19 persons |
| | (9) Unknown |

E5) In the past one year do you have the following interaction with your neighbors?

- (1) Very Often (2) Some- times (3) Rarely (4) Seldom

- 1) Chatting
- 2) Lend/borrow seasonings
- 3) Look after the children
- 4) Mutual visit
- 5) Shopping/outing together
- 6) Have the children played/watched TV together
- 7) Others: _____

E6) Generally speaking, how do you think about your relationship with neighbors?

- (1) Very satisfactory
- (2) Satisfactory
- (3) Fair
- (4) Unsatisfactory
- (5) Very unsatisfactory

(F) PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

F1) Do you join any organizations as a member?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No (skip to G1)

F2) How long have you joined the organization?

- (1) under 2 years
- (2) 2 - 5 years
- (3) 6 - 9 years
- (4) 10 or above
- (9) Unknown

F3) Are you the committee member or official in the organization(s) you joined?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No
- (9) Unknown

F4) In the past one year, did you attend the meeting of the organization(s) you joined?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No
- (9) Forgotten

F5) Besides attending the meeting, do you help the organization(s) in any work/task?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No
- (9) Unknown

F6) In the past one year, how many days in average you spent to work for the organization(s) you joined per month?

- (1) None
- (2) 1-2 days
- (3) 3 days or above
- (9) Unknown

(G) PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

G1) In the past one year, did you join any activities organized by any organization(s)?

(1) Yes--- then how many times?

(1) 1-2 times

(2) 3 times

(9) Unknown

(2) No

G2) In the past one year, did you read Kwun Tong Community Newspaper?

(1) Yes--- then how many times?

(1) 1-2 times

(2) 3 times or above

(9) unknown

(2) No

G3) Did you join the following community campaign/activities when you're living there?

(1)
Yes

(2)
No

(3)
Unknown

Campaign/activities

1. Cleaning campaign
2. Anti-crime campaign
3. Anti-corruption campaign
4. District Board activities
5. Activities organized by Caritas
6. Others: _____

H. PARTICIPATION IN ELECTION ACTIVITIES

H1) Have you registered as voter ?

(1) Yes (skip to H2)

(2) No/not eligible

If No/not eligible, will you register as voter?

(1) Will

(2) Will not

(3) May be or may not be

(9) Unknown

H2) Have you voted in the following Election?

(1)	(2)	(3)	(9)
Yes	No	For- gotten	Not Registered

Election Activities

- (a) District Board Election in March
- (b) Urban Council Election in May
- (c) Legislative Council Election in September

H3) Did you pay attention or participate in any election activities in the past election(s)?
(please read the following)

(1)	(2)
Yes	No

Election Activities

- (1) Pay attention to the promotion pamphlets of the electees
- (2) Listen to the information of the electees from mass media
- (3) Attended the forum of the electee
- (4) Had participated in the election work of any electees
- (5) Others _____
- (9) None of the above

H4) Has the building attempted to seek helps from District Board /Urban Council /Legislative Council members to solve the buildings' problem or invite them to attend residents meeting?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No
- (9) Unknown

H5) Do you know the name of the elected members of the following Board/Council in your District?
(Do not hint the interviewee, let them think)

(1)Can (2)Cannot (9)Unknown

- (1) District Board
- (2) Urban Council
- (3) Legislative Council

H6) Have you joined any following activities when living in this building?

Activities

(1)Yes (2)No (9)Unknown

- (1) Sit-in the meeting of DB/UC/LC
- (2) Joining the activities organized by DB/UC/LC
- (3) Joining the activities organized by office of DB/UC/LC members
- (4) Having interviewed with any member of DB/UC/LC
- (5) Having referred complaints of building to any member of DB/UC/LC
- (6) Joining the work of any member of DB/UC/LC
- (7) Others: _____
- (8) None of above

- END -

Thank you for your cooperation

CUHK Libraries



000275926